

51—1

* THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, *
* Princeton, N. J. 51-1 *
*
* From the Rev. W. B. SPRAGUE, D.D. Sept. 1839. *

<i>Case,</i>	Division.....
<i>Shelf,</i>	Section.....
<i>Book,</i>	No.....

SCC
2341

AN
Essay on Spirit,

WHEREIN
The Doctrine of the TRINITY

IS CONSIDERED
In the Light of NATURE and REASON;

AS WELL AS
In the Light in which it was held by the
ancient *Hebrews* :

Compared also with the Doctrine of the
Old and New Testament.

WITH
AN INQUIRY into the Sentiments of the Primitive
Fathers of the Church :

AND
The Doctrine of the TRINITY as maintained by the
Egyptians, Pythagoreans, and Platonists.

TOGETHER WITH
Some REMARKS on
The ATHANASIAN and NICENE CREEDS.

*Inanimum est omne, quod impulsu agitur externo; quod
autem animal est, id motu cietur interiore, et suo.*

Cic. Somn. Scip.

THE SECOND EDITION, with
ADDITIONS and CORRECTIONS by the AUTHOR.

LONDON, printed :
And sold by J. NOON in the *Poultry*, G. WOODFALL
at *Charing-Cross*, and M. COOPER in *Pater-noster-row*.

MDCCLII.

[Price sew'd 2 s. 6d.]



TO,
HIS GRACE
GEORGE,
LORD PRIMATE
OF ALL
IRELAND.

MY LORD,

AS I am a Clergyman of the
established Church, and have
for some Years been possessed
of an Ecclesiastical Preferment, in-
to which, before I could be admit-
ted,

ted, I was obliged to subscribe the four first Canons, which include my Assent to the Articles of our Religion, and, also to declare publicly my unfeigned Assent and Consent to all and every thing, contained in *The Book of Common-Prayer*: And, as I have not been so much employed about my temporal Affairs, but that I have found Leisure to apply some Time to my Books, and to *think* as well as *read*; I find that I do not now agree exactly in Sentiment, either with my former Opinions, or with those Persons who drew up the Articles of our Religion, or with the Compilers of our Liturgy, and in particular, with the *Athanasian* Creed: And therefore I have laboured under

DEDICATION.

v

der some Difficulties, how to direct myself in these Circumstances.

There was a Sermon preached, not many Years ago, by Dr. *Conybear*, before the University of *Oxford*, which seems to have been approved of by them; and which hath since been reprinted in *Ireland*, wherein he asserts, that every one who subscribes the Articles of Religion, does thereby engage, not only not to dispute or contradict them; but that his Subscription amounts to an Approbation of, and an Assent to the Truth of the Doctrine therein contained, in the very Sense which the Compilers thereof are supposed to have understood them: That they are not to be

considered as Articles of Peace, but of Doctrine, as the very Title denotes, which is *For the avoiding Diversities of Opinions, and for establishing Consent touching true Religion.* Whereas I apprehend any Attempt towards avoiding Diversity of Opinions, not only to be an useles, but also an impracticable Scheme; since I do not only doubt whether the Compilers of the Articles, but even whether any two *thinking Men* ever agreed exactly in their Opinion, not only with Regard to All the Articles, but even with Regard to any One of them; so that if they were to give their own Interpretation of them, there would be found as many different Sentiments as there were Interpreters; The Difference indeed
would

DEDICATION. vii

would not always be great; but still there would be a Difference.

I said *thinking Men*, for, as to the unthinking Herd, whatever was the Creed of their Father, or Tutor, that will be theirs, from their Infancy, to their Lives End; and accordingly, whatever Country you go into, let the Religion be what it will, the unthinking Part thereof are always the reputed Orthodox.

An *Uniformity of Profession* may indeed be both practicable and useful; and seems in some degree to be necessary, not only for the Preservation of Peace, but also for the general Good and Welfare of Society

a 4

viii DEDICATION.

ciety : Since I do not conceive how any Society or Common-wealth can subsist, unless some Form of Religion or other be established therein ; as well with regard to Points of Doctrine as Discipline ; which however ought to be as plain, few, and fundamental, as possible. And as no established Form of Religion can subsist, unless that Form be publicly made known, and the Teachers thereof are laid under some Obligation, either by Subscription or otherwise, of complying with that Form, and of not preaching, or publicly teaching, any Doctrine contrary thereto ; so, I own, I do not see any manner of Impropriety in the legislative Power of any Society insisting upon such a kind of Subscription,

Subscription, as is only required to be made for Peace-sake, and the Preservation of the outward Forms of Society: Since a Man under these Circumstances may, for prudential Reasons, honestly subscribe and submit *to the Use* of one established Form, though he, in his own private Opinion, may think another to be better; provided that he is not obliged to subscribe any thing sinful; or so diametrically opposite to Truth, as that he cannot possibly put any other Construction upon it.

The first Subscription, that I know of, was set on foot at the Council of *Nice*, when the famous Contest about the Trinity was determined

terminated in Favour of the *consubstantial* Doctrine, by a Majority of near Twenty to One : To which the Emperor required all the Bishops then present to subscribe. But then he allowed every one to put their own Sense upon the Word *Consubstantial*, and not the Sense that was intended by the Compilers of the Creed : And accordingly, *Eusebius* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, though he at first refused subscribing, yet when he was allowed to interpret the Word *Consubstantial*, as meaning only, *that the Son was not of the same Substance with the Creatures that were made by him*; he then subscribed it, and so, in a little Time after, did *Arius*.

Peace

Peace was what the Emperor wanted, and therefore he was content with Peace: But from the Time that Power was put into the Hands of the Church of *Rome*, implicit Faith and Obedience to her infallible Determinations being what she required ; unless Subscriptions were then to be understood as made according to the Sense of the Compilers of the Articles, the Recusants were anathematized, and Fire and Faggot was the Word.

But as I apprehend that the Church of *Ireland* doth not set up for Infallibility, I do not think that she requireth any other Kind of Subscription than such as is necessary

fary for Peace and Quietness : And therefore I am now not much disturbed upon this Head. I likewise find by the Words of the Act of Parliament, which enjoins the Declaration of our “ Assent and Consent to all Things contained in *The Book of Common-Prayer*,” that the Purport and Intent of the Act is, that this Declaration of Assent should be only *to the Use of* those Things which are contained in the said Book, which is very different from assenting to the Things themselves ; and therefore I am pretty easy also with regard to this.

How these Words, *to the Use of*, came to be omitted in the express Form of Words that are ordered

I

DEDICATION. xiii

dered to be read in Church for a legal Qualification, I cannot say, nor whether they were omitted out of Neglect, or by Design; but I own it seems to me, when I consider the Humour of the Times when that Act was made, that it was done with Design; as a Snare, to oblige poor [1] conscientious Men, who did not read the Act of Parliament at length, to give up their Livings, rather than declare their “unfeigned Assent and Consent to all
“and every thing contained in *The*
“*Book of Common-Prayer.*” For it is to be observed, that this Condition was not required by the *Act of*

[1] And accordingly, there were 1800 Persons that were actually deprived of their Livings, rather than submit to the Terms prescribed.

Uniformity,

Uniformity, as published in the Time of Queen *Elizabeth*, but was an Addition made thereto, after the Restoration of King *Charles* the Second, when the Nation was, as it were, mad with the Joy of having recovered its ancient Constitution both in Church and State ; The little Oath therefore, wherein it was declared, *that it is not lawful, upon any Pretence whatsoever, to take Arms against the King*, was at the same time inserted into the *Act of Uniformity*. Which Part of that Act hath been since repealed ; and indeed I cannot but sincerely wish, that the other Addition, which was made at the same time, was so far rectified, that the Words of the Declaration should
be

be made to correspond with the Design of the Act, which manifestly was, to require the Declaration of Assent and Consent only *to the Use of* all and every thing contained in *The Book of Common-Prayer*. Because I think that That solemn Declaration, which a Clergyman is obliged to make in the Presence of God and his Congregation, when he is going to take upon himself the Care of their Souls, ought to be simple, positive, plain; free from all Ambiguity or Doubtfulness; and should be expressed in such a Manner, as that it cannot be misunderstood, either by him, or by the Congregation; but that he may safely and honestly make it, according to that *plain and ordinary Sense*

xvi DEDICATION.

Sense of the Words, in which they would *commonly be understood* by all Mankind, *without any Evasion, Equivocation, or mental Reservation whatsoever*; that is, without any latent Reference to the Intention of the Act, which is not expressed in the very Words of the Declaration.

And indeed I am the more desirous of this, because I know for a Certainty, that some of the most learned and conscientious Persons among the Dissenters, have made the Form of our Declaration of “un-
“ feigned Assent and Consent to All
“ and Every thing contained in *The*
“ *Book of Common-Prayer*,” an Ob-
jection,

tions were declared to be only required for Peace-sake; yet there is still a Difficulty which remains behind, with regard to those who do not approve of all the Articles of the established Religion or of every thing in the Liturgy; because it is natural for them to desire, that those Things, which they take to be Errors, should be amended; and yet it is found by experience, that whoever attempts to find fault with the Canons or the Articles of Religion, or the established Form of Liturgy, becomes immediately a Disturber of the Peace of the Church, as he is sure, at least, to be loaded with the opprobrious Name of *Schismatic*, or *Heretic*, which, ever since the days of *Pope*,
pery,

DEDICATION. xix

pery, are Sounds that occasion wondrous Horror in the Ears of the Vulgar.

Whoever considers the Difficulties which attend the Reformation of Religion in general, and, in particular, the Difficulties which attended these Nations in their Reformation from *Popery*, ought to thank God, that so much was done at that Time as was done, rather than repine that more was not effected. The Humour of the Times would not suffer a more thorough Reformation; these Nations having been so long accustomed to a Kind of utter Darknes, that their Eyes would not bear too much Light to be let in at once

xx DEDICATION.

Christianity was not established, nor the *Jewish* Religion thoroughly reformed, all on a sudden. After *St. Paul* had been many Years a Preacher of the Gospel, he complied with the *Jewish* Ceremony of [2] *shaving his Head in Cenckrea, because he was under a Vow*; and of [3] purifying himself at the Temple of *Jerusalem*, rather than give Offence to the *Jews*. And the whole Council of Apostles, when assembled at *Jerusalem*, assented to enjoin those [4] *Jewish* Profelytes, who, from among the *Gentiles*, were turned unto God, to continue for some

[2] Acts xviii. 1.

[3] Acts xxi. 24.

[4] Acts xv. 19. xx. 29.

DEDICATION. xxi

time under a Prohibition from eating Things strangled, and from Blood, which hath been long since discontinued. And our Saviour himself was pleased to declare, that he concealed many Truths, till the Disciples should be *able to bear them*, John xvi. 12

The present Constitution of these Kingdoms, both in Church and State, is, in my sincere Opinion, the best in the known World; but I will not say, that it is not capable of being still further amended. What then is to be done? For if the Church be not infallible any more than the State, why may not that be amended as well as the State? And why should we be

xxii DEDICATION.

more afraid of breaking the Peace of the Church than of the State? The Peace of the one being full as necessary to be preserved as the Peace of the other.

The *Christian* Religion was, at its first Propagation, called a [5] *Heresy*; and therefore [6] *St. Paul*, in his Apology to *Felix*, said, *This I confess, that after the Way which they call HERESY, so worship I the God of my Fathers.* Which Denomination was continued to it, so long as to the Time of *Constantine* the Great, who, in his Epistle to *Chrestus* Bishop of *Syracuse*, calls

[5] Acts xxviii. 22.

[6] Acts xxiv. 5, 14.

DEDICATION. xxiii

the *Christian* Religion the [7] *Catholic Heresy*: Which Letter was written after the Emperor had declared in favour of *Christianity*.

Αἵρεσις, according to *Stephens*, signifies, in general, the same thing with the *Latin* Words *Secta* and *Dogma*, that is, a *Sect* or *Opinion*. And accordingly he reckons up ten Sects or Heresies of the ancient Philosophers. But among the Ecclesiastical Writers, says he, it signifies an Opinion, or *Sect that is contrary to the orthodox Faith*. But as the established Religion of every Country is that which consti-

[7] Τῆς αἱρέσεως τῆς καθολικῆς. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. cap. 5.

xxiv DEDICATION.

tutes *Orthodoxy*, according to the common Sense of the Word; hence it is, that they who differ and separate therefrom are generally called *Hereticks*; and hence it comes to pass, that a Person may be esteemed as very orthodox in *England* or *Ireland*, who would be deemed as an Heretic at *Rome*, or in other Countries. And for the same Reason it was, that the *Christians* were at first called *Heretics* in *Judea*, because they separated from the *Jewish*, which was the established Religion of the Country; and were also called *Heretics* in *Rome*, because they refused joining with the *Heathen*, which was the then established Religion there.

It

It is therefore possible that an Heretic may be in the right; according to the original Sense of the Word. It is also possible that he may be in the wrong. And therefore St. *Peter* says, [8] *There are false Teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable Heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.* And St. *Paul* says, [9] *I hear there are Schisms among you; and I partly believe it: For* THERE MUST BE ALSO HERESIES, *that they which are approved may be made manifest.* Now there is no other necessity for Heresies being among them but this: That God

[8] 2 Pet. ii. 1.

[9] 1 Cor xi. 18, 19.

xxvi DEDICATION.

did not frame human Nature in such a Manner as to necessitate all Men to be of one Mind ; but having made Mankind to be free Agents, he *left them in the Hand of their own Council*, to chuse their own Opinions for themselves ; according to the Merit or Demerit of which Choice, they will be proper Subjects for Rewards or Punishments. And therefore, while this Constitution of human Nature remains, *there must be* Schisms, Divisions, Heresies, or a Diversity of Sects among them. And as all Mankind think themselves to be in the right, so they naturally conclude all those who differ from them to be in the wrong ; and hence it comes to pass, that the Word *Heretic*

DEDICATION. xxvii

retic is generally used in a bad Sense, though because a Person is an Heretic, or is of a different Sect from the established Religion, it does by no means follow, that therefore he must be in the wrong. If the Persons from whom he differs should be infallible, as it is allowed the Apostles were, then indeed it would follow, of consequence, that the Heretic or Separatist must be in an Error. And if, after Instruction and Admonition, he will not amend, it is then fit he should be ejected, or excommunicated out of the Society of the Faithful, lest his Exemption from Punishment should give Encouragement to the Seduction of others; for though it cannot be supposed that his Excommunication

nication

xxviii DEDICATION.

nication will amend himself, yet it may contribute to save other Persons.

And hence it is, that *St. Paul*, in his Advice to *Titus*, says, *A Man that is an Heretic, after the first and second Admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.* Which Admonition and Rejection shews the Crime of Heresy to consist in an Error of the Will, rather than of the Judgment; for otherwise *Titus* would have been directed to instruct such a Person, rather than to admonish him. But as it is to be supposed that Information and Instruction would be first tried by *Titus*, even
before

D E D I C A T I O N. xxix

before the first Admonition, therefore it is the Perverseness of his Will, in still persisting in his Sect or Heresy after Admonition, that seems to be the Cause and Foundation of his Excommunication: For, says St. *Paul*, such a one is *subverted* from the Faith, and *sinneth*, by persevering therein after Admonition; and is *self-condemned*, as having no Excuse of Ignorance to plead after his being admonished thereof: He may indeed not be *self-condemned* with regard to his Error, because he may not be convinced that he is in an Error; but may think himself to be in the right, when he is in the wrong: Whereas, with regard to his Heresy,

xxx DEDICATION.

refy or Separation from the Church to which he belonged, he cannot be ignorant therof, after Admonition, for differing from the Sense of the Church ; And therefore if he perfifts therein after being admonished, he must be *self-condemned*, with regard to his Perseverance in opposition to the Church.

And as every legislative Power is so far infallible, as it is the dernier Refort, and only Judge now left upon Earth, of what is right and wrong, within the Limits of its own Jurisdiction ; therefore when any Form of Religion hath been once established, they who separate therefrom or act in direct Opposition to its Commands, are to be
treated

DEDICATION. xxxi

treated as if such legislative Power was infallible; and if they will not submit, upon Admonition, are to be rejected, to prevent others from being seduced, and to preserve the Peace of Society.

By which Rejection or Excommunication, I do not mean an Exclusion from Civil Rights, and the Protection of the Civil Magistrate, but only from the outward and visible Communion of the Church, and its faithful Members, and all the particular Benefits which properly belong thereto, or may result therefrom; from which as it is by their own Choice that they differ, in disobeying its Rules, or rejecting its Communion, it can be no Injustice

justice that they should be excluded, if they still persist in their Disobedience after Admonition.

Since therefore it appears, that a Man's being of a wrong Opinion is not that which properly denominates him an *Heretic*, but rather his being of a different Opinion from the Majority; one would be apt to wonder why that Word, in general, should have so bad an Idea annexed to it; but that the Answer thereto is obvious, *viz.* That it arises from our having too great a Fondness for ourselves, and our own Opinions; and too great an Aversion to those who differ in Opinion from us.

There

DEDICATION. xxxiii

There is indeed no Reason to be assigned in general, why Men should be more displeased with one another for being of different Opinions, than for their being of different Sizes, or for having a different personal Appearance. And were it not that Experience convinces us of the Matter of Fact, it would be hard to believe that Men's Passions could carry them to that Degree of Animosity against each other, on account of Opinions barely speculative, which we find practised in all Countries, and almost all Ages.

I can very well conceive why Men should contract an Aversion
c and

xxxiv DEDICATION.

and an Hatred for one another about Opinions where their temporal Interests are concerned ; and do not wonder when I read, that [1] *Demetrius* the Silversmith raised a Tumult against *Paul* at *Ephesus*, for saying, that *they be no Gods which are made with Hands*, because by this bold Assertion, as *Demetrius* acknowledged, this *Craft* was in danger to be set at nought, and, ye know, *Sirs*, said he, *that by this Craft we have our Wealth*.

But it is not so easy to account why one Man should bear an ill Will to his Neighbour, or any of his Fellow-Creatures, for being of

[1] Acts xix. 24.

DEDICATION. xxxv

a different Opinion from him in Matters barely speculative, in which the other is no way concerned, further than as he is a [2] Man, and a Lover of Mankind. In which Respect every Body ought to be so far concerned for his Fellow-Creatures as to do all that lies in his Power to contribute to the Happiness of each other ; but then this is to be done in a proper, kind, and friendly Manner : And, if that will not prevail, contrary Methods ought by no means to be attempted ; since that Principle which directs us to use all Men well, can never vindicate us in using any Man ill.

[2] *Homo sum, humani nihil à me alienum puto.*

xxxvi DEDICATION.

If one Man is a *Christian*, and another is a *Jew*, *Turk*, or Infidel, of any Denomination, there can be no more Reason for having a Dislike upon that account to each other, than because they were not all born in the same Country, or bred up under the same Tutor, or do not all speak the same Language; since ninety-nine in an hundred of those who are *Christians*, would probably have been *Mahometans*, if they had been born in *Turkey*, and would have imbibed their Religion, as they do their native Tongue, along with their Mother's Milk: And the same may be said of *Jews* or *Mahometans*, that they would have been *Christians*,

DEDICATION. xxxvii

stians, if they had been born in a *Christian* Country, and of *Christian* Parents.

If it pleases the Almighty to endow one Man with a better Understanding, or greater natural Abilities of any kind, than his Neighbour, to appoint the Place of his Birth, where he has better Opportunities of being informed in true Religion, or to produce him from such Parents as will take care that he is better educated in the Paths of Virtue: these are Blessings for which he ought to be thankful to his Creator; but are far from being any Reason why he should bear an Ill-will to those Persons, who have not received the same Advantages

xxxviii DEDICATION.

Advantages from Providence; or why he should not live in a kind and neighbourly Manner with them, though he thinks them in an Error with regard to their religious Principles.

And yet Experience convinces us, that the Conduct of Mankind is quite otherwise; which can be attributed to nothing but a vicious Pride in our Nature, which makes us not content with the Applause of our own Conscience, when we think ourselves in the Right, unless we have the Applause of others also. And renders us solicitous to gain Followers and Admirers, at the same Time that it gives us an
Aversion

DEDICATION. xxxix

Aversion for every one that differs
in Opinion from us.

Athanasius, in answer to this Question, Πόθεν λέγεται Αἵρεσις; unde dicitur *Hæresis*? saith, Ἀπὸ τῆ αἰρεῖσθαι τι ἴδιον, ἢ τῷ ἐξακολουθεῖν, *Ab eligendo & prosequendo sententiam suam privatam*. So that the conceiving of Error is not that which constitutes the Crime of Heresy, but the prosecuting and persevering in it, to the raising of a Party, and exciting *Followers*, whence also the Word *Sect* is derived; and for this Reason it is that St. *Paul* reckons up *Heresies* among such [3] Works of the Flesh, as *Hatred, Variance, Emu-*

[3] Gal. v. 20, 21.

xl DEDICATION.

lations, Wrath, Strife, Seditions, Envyings, Murders, and such like, as it is near of Kind to them, and may be the Foundation and Cause of them.

What then is it the Duty of any Person to do, who is the professed Member of any established Church, if he sees, or imagines he sees, any Errors, either in the Doctrine or Discipline of that Church? Must he, for fear of disturbing the Peace of the Church and being deemed a Schismatic, or Heretic, sit down quietly, and not endeavour to set them to Rights? Or, must he fly off, and separate immediately from it?

As

As to the First, if Men were not to declare their Opinions, in spight of Establishments either in Church or State, Truth would soon be banished the Earth. Error puts on so much a fairer Outside, ornaments itself with so many plausible Appearances, and comes loaded with so many Bribes to tempt us from our Duty; that if Truth did not sometimes shew itself, and exert its Abilities in its own Defence, the World would be soon over-run with Error, as an uncultivated Garden with Weeds. Of which the Experience of Times past is sufficient to convince us, by the Growth and Continuance of Errors in the Church of *Rome*, from the Time that the
Bible

xlii DEDICATION.

Bible was shut, and the Court of Inquisition opened.

And as to the Second, whoever he is who thinks he ought to separate from that Church wherein he sees some Errors, if it will not immediately reform and amend them; and thinks it his Duty to refuse joining in Communion with any Set of Men, till he meets with a Constitution, either in Church or State, that is absolutely free from Errors; such an one, I fear, is not fitted for this World, but must live by himself, till he is conducted into a Society of Angels.

In my Opinion, therefore, the middle Course is that which he
ought

DEDICATION. xliii

ought to pursue, which in this Affair, as well as most others, is certainly the best.

Let us consider how a Person in like Circumstances, with regard to the State, ought to conduct himself; and this may perhaps determine our Behaviour with regard to the other. For we generally talk more calmly, as well as more rationally, concerning the Affairs of the State, than of the Church.

Suppose a Person sees any Errors in that Constitution of Government under which he lives; may he not, ought he not to lay his Opinion before the Legislative Powers of that Society, in order to procure

xliv DEDICATION.

an Amendment of it? I think he ought. But then he ought at the same time, unless in Cases of the utmost Necessity, where the Vitals of the Constitution are in Danger, not only not to desert the State, though the Amendment should not be made; but also to avoid raising *Parties* or *Factions* in the State, for the Support of his Opinion; which in the Ecclesiastical Style, would be called *Heresies*.

But to this it is objected, that here the Parallel will not hold, because Men's temporal Interests will restrain them from overturning the Establishment of the State; whereas too many would be very glad to have the Establishment of the Church
quite

quite set aside. It may therefore be dangerous to begin with making Alterations or Amendments in the Church, lest those Scaffoldings which are erected for Repairs, should be made use of to pull down the whole Fabric.

With humble Submission however to these cautious Gentlemen, I am under less Apprehension for the Church than for the State: For, as to the *Christian* Religion in general, we have the sure Word of Prophecy, that *the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*. And as to particular Establishments, I should apprehend, that the freer they were from Errors, the more likely they would be to stand. At least, I should

should think it would be right to run some Risque, and place some Trust in the Providence of God, rather than let Errors of any Consequence remain.

But, say they again, *Truth is not to be spoken at all Times.* Which I will allow so far, as to acknowledge, that Prudence and Temper is to be made use of even in the Publication of Truth; but not that Truth may be concealed for ever, under the Pretence, that the Publication of it at present would be out of Season; for if Error may be safely established, and Truth concealed, how can we vindicate all that Outcry that was made by *Protestants* against the Doctrine of
Transub-

DEDICATION. xlvii

Transubstantiation, &c? Since it is manifest, that, before the Reformation took place, the same Arguments were then made use of against any Innovations in Religion that are now. And all Alterations in the established Form of Worship were then as much declaimed against by the Ecclesiastics of those Days, as they can be at present.

I am not against joining the Wisdom of the Serpent with the Innocence of the Dove: But I would not have the Wisdom of the Serpent without the Innocence of the Dove. Let us be as wise as possible in defending what is right in our Establishment, but let us not exert the same Wisdom in defending

ing

xlviiii DEDICATION.

ing what is wrong. But, above all, let us, in the Name of God, take care, that our Foundations be clear, and that our Articles and Creeds are free from Error.

The Author of these Papers, though he hath addressed them to YOUR GRACE, is very sensible, that it is not in Your Power, nor in that of all the Ecclesiastics of the Land, to alter the established Form of Worship; he knows, that the *Act of Uniformity*, upon which it depends, and of which our Liturgy is a Part, was passed into a Law, by the joint Consent of the three Estates of the Realm; and he trusts in God, that he never shall see the Church independent on the State.

But,

DEDICATION. xlix

But, my LORD, though the Bishops and Clergy, either in or out of Convocation, cannot redress, yet they may recommend; the Author, however, cannot but remark, that he does not recollect any Instance in History, since the Times of the Apostles, where the Reformation of Religion in any material Points hath been brought about by the Influence of the Clergy in general; the Bulk of them, who are always the least knowing, being most tenacious of old Opinions. The Pope, indeed, every now and then, makes some Reformation of the Calendar of Saints, and strikes out a few antiquated Holy-days, in order to make Room for new Canoniza-
d tions:

1 DEDICATION.

tions: But if we are to take our Precedents from what hath hitherto passed in the Reformation of any material Points in Religion, it must be effected by a few leading Persons among the Clergy, when supported by the upper and more thinking Part of the Laity.

And, as it hath pleased God and His Majesty to call you to the Primacy of this Church, the Author cannot think of any Person more proper to address himself to at present, than Your GRACE ; as well on account of Your personal Abilities, as of Your Interest with those leading Members of the Society, whether Laymen or Clergy, who compose the Legislative Power of this Realm.

And

DEDICATION. li

And as he thinks this to be the most proper and *Christian* Method of conveying his own Sentiments to *the Powers that be*; so hath he also published his Sentiments in the Garb of a metaphysical Essay, to prevent their falling into the Hands of the lower Class of Readers, whose Thoughts might be disturbed by an Enquiry into Subjects of this Nature; till by gentle Degrees they come, by the Blessing of God, to be made a Part of the established Religion of the Country; which will give them a proper Recommendation and Weight with those, who are not otherwise capable of judging of them.

Not that he expects, that every Thing, which he hath advanced

in this *Essay*, is to be received by his Reader as an Article of Faith, but only that it may have its due Weight in his serious Considerations; for as he is desirous, that no human Conjectures may be imposed upon him, as of equal Authority with Divine Revelation; so neither does he desire, that his Conjectures should be obtruded upon others.

The Author is thoroughly convinced, that Ministers of State will be very cautious, and with great Reason, how they embroil themselves with religious Disputes. But as he does not apprehend, that there is any Need of pursuing violent Methods, so neither does he expect that a thorough Reformation of
every

D E D I C A T I O N. liii

every thing that may be amended, should be made all at once. He could wish, however, that something was done, to convince the World, that the Clergy of the Church of *Ireland*, are not averſe to a proper Reformation of ſuch Parts of her Public Service, as demand a more immediate Revival; ſince, otherwiſe, they may give Offence by their Obſtinacy, and ſeeming Infallibility; and if a Storm ſhould ariſe, may run a Riſque of having that Tree torn up by the Roots, which might have been ſaved by a little pruning.

As the Laws of the Land require Subſcriptions to be made to the Canons and Articles of our Religion, only by Clergymen, Fellows

liv DEDICATION.

of Colleges, Clerks, and School-Masters, so these do not seem to need that immediate Redress, which those Parts of our Worship require, in which the whole Community are expected to join.

He thinks, that he need not inform Your GRACE, That that Creed, which is commonly called the *Athanasian* Creed, hath of a long Time given Offence, and continueth to give great Offence to many People. And indeed not without Reason, if we consider it only in this Light, that the Subject of a great Part of it, is a Theologico-Metaphysical Dispute, which few, if any, of the Learned understand; but is undoubtedly above the Capacity of the Vulgar; and
yet,

D E D I C A T I O N. lv

yet, by being made a Part of our Public Service, every Body, as well low as high, is required to assent to it.

It is also now universally acknowledged among the Learned, that it was originally a spurious Production, imposed upon the World under the Name of *Athanasius*, till detected by the Criticisms of the learned *Vossius*. But, supposing it had been a genuine Piece, and had been undoubtedly written by *Athanasius*, there can be no Reason assigned, why the Members of the Church of *Ireland* should be tied down to assent to the Compositions of a private Person, who had no other Merit, which the Author can find, for being declared a Saint, but his base and low Sub-

lvi DEDICATION.

mission to the Bishop of *Rome*, who had no legal Authority over him ; and his insolent Behaviour to his lawful Prince, who undoubtedly had a Right to his Obedience.

The Author does, by no means, presume to prescribe to Your GRACE; but he thinks himself in duty obliged to recommend it to Your Consideration, whether the first Step to be taken is not to try to get the Words in the Declaration of Assent and Consent made agreeable to the Intention of the Act, which was attempted in *England*, A.D. 1663, about a Year after the last *Act of Uniformity*, and passed the House of Lords, but was thrown out in the House of Commons, by the then over-ruling Influence of the Duke

DEDICATION. lvii

Duke of *York*, and his Party, who did not let the Clause proposed pass even the House of Lords without a Ptoteft. But, as we are now, thank God, free from any Apprehensions of the prevailing Influence of such an Administration, he hopes Your GRACE will not decline making the Attempt here, as he apprehends it will open a Freedom of Conversation among those Persons, who have hitherto imagined themselves to be Tongue-tied, by having publicly and absolutely given their unfeigned Assent and Consent to all and every thing contained in the *Book of Common-Prayer*.

Which will be a proper, if not necessary, Preparative to a gradual Reception of those further Emendations

lviii DEDICATION.

dations of our Liturgy, which are proposed by some anonymous Authors, in the second Edition of a Book, lately published, entitled *Free and candid Disquisitions relating to the Church of England*. With whom, though the Author of these Papers does not agree in Opinion, concerning the Doctrine contained in the *Athanasian Creed*, and a few other Particulars: Yet he cannot avoid giving them their due Commendations, for the true *Christian Spirit of Candour, Moderation, and Meekness*, which breathes through their whole Performance.

It is indeed prohibited by the *Act of Uniformity*, under severe Penalties, for any Person *to preach, declare, or speak any thing to the*
Dero-

Derogation or depraving the Book of Common-Prayer, or any Part thereof; which, however, is by no means inconsistent with that *Christian Liberty* of a decent and free Use either of Conversation, or of the Press, concerning any Alterations or Amendments, which it may be right and prudent to have made therein. As he apprehends, that every Person is liable to be punished by the Laws of the Land, who shall *preach, declare, or speak to the Derogation or depraving any Act of Parliament*, while it continues in Force; And yet common Reason, as well as common Custom, allows every Person to propose Alterations, and speak his Mind with regard to any Amendments, which
may

IX DEDICATION.

may be made therein, provided it be done with common Decency, and a due Respect to the Legislative Powers of the Realm.

And when this is complied with, he then looks upon it as the Duty of such as see any Errors in the Constitution, either of Church or State, to lay their Sentiments before *the Powers that be*, in order to produce an Amendment; which is the Motive that prevails with the Author of these Papers, to give YOUR GRACE the Trouble of this Address; and to recommend to those in Authority the Consideration of the Advice given by the learned and religious Dr. *Hammond*, in his Treatise, entitled, [4] *A View*

[4] See Sect. 40.

of

DEDICATION. lxi

of the new Directory. Where, speaking in favour of the Moderation used in our Church-Catechism, he saith, “ If we would all keep ourselves within that Moderation, and propose no larger Catalogue of *Credenda* to be believed by all than the *Apostles Creed*, as it is explained in our *Catechism*, doth propose; and lay the greater Weight upon the Consideration and Performance of the Vow of Baptism, and all the Commands of God, as they are explained by *Christ*; — I should be confident there would be less hating and *damning* one another, (which is most ordinarily for Opinions) more *Piety* and *Charity*, and so true *Christianity* among
“ *Christians*

lxii DEDICATION.

“ *Christians* and *Protestants*, than
“ hath hitherto been met with.”
Which would be the most proper
Method that could be taken, to render the Church of *Ireland* truly *catholic* ; not by driving Members out of its *Pale*, on account of human Appointments and Determinations, in imitation of the Church of *Rome* ; but by opening the Gates of its Communion as wide as was consistent with the Gospel of *Christ*.

The Preface to our *Book of Common-Prayer* declares, that “ the particular Forms of divine Worship, and
“ the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being Things
“ in their own Nature indifferent
“ and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, that
“ upon weighty and important Consider-

DEDICATION. lxiii

“ fiderations, according to the various
 “ Exigencies of Times and Occasions,
 “ fuch Changes and Alterations may
 “ be made therein, as to thofe that are
 “ in Place and Authority fhould,
 “ from Time to Time, feem either ne-
 “ ceflary or expedient.”

The Eyes of Mankind have been greatly opened, not only fince the Reformation, but even fince the Revolution. And that Liberty of Converfation and the Preſs, which the Inhabitants of theſe Kingdoms have ever fince been gloriouſly indulged in, hath much promoted a Freedom of thinking, which was curbed and kept down, during the Dominion and Influence of *Popery*.

And as at preſent the Generality of theſe Nations ſeem more inclinable to liſten to Reaſon than formerly, the Author of theſe Papers hath that Con-
I
fidence

lxiv DEDICATION.

fidence both in the Soundness of Your GRACE's Judgment, and the Prudence of Your Conduct, that he makes no Doubt of Your doing every thing that is proper upon this Occasion, to remove those Rocks of Offence, which lie in the way of so many well-meaning Persons.

This Attempt of his, he thinks, however, for many Reasons, to be worth the making, because, though it should not succeed, yet he is sure of having that Satisfaction from it, that he can say, *Liberavi Animam meam*: SEE YE TO IT: And that it furnishes him with an Opportunity of professing himself to be

Your GRACE's

Most devoted, and

Most obedient

Humble Servant.

Robert Clayton,

Bishop of Clogher.

A N
E S S A Y
O N
S P I R I T.

I. **T**HE Opinion of [1] *Spinoza* was, that there is no other *Substance* in Nature but God: That Modes cannot subsist, or be conceived, without a Substance: That there is nothing in Nature but Modes and Substances: And that therefore every thing must be conceived as subsisting in God.

Which Opinion, with some few Alterations, hath been embraced and culti-

[1] Præter Deum nulla datur, nec concipi potest *Substantia*, (per Proposit. xiv.) hoc est (per Defin.) Res, quæ in se est, & per se concipitur. *Modi* autem (per Defin. v.) sine *Substantia*, nec esse, nec concipi possunt: Quare hi in sola divina natura esse, & per ipsam solam concipi possunt.

Spin. *Oper posth. Ethices par. I. pag. 12.*

B

vated,

2 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

vated, by *P. Malbranche* and Bishop *Berkeley*.

II. It may indeed be asserted, that there is in Nature but one Self-existent Being, Subsistence, or Substance, which, by way of Eminence, may therefore be called *the Substance*; or, figuratively and comparatively speaking, *the only Being, Subsistence, or Substance* in Nature. For by these three Words, I would be understood to mean one and the same Thing. The Logicians define *Substantia* to be *Ens per se subsistens & subsistans accidentibus*. And I mean the same Thing by a *Being, Existence, Subsistence, or Substance*; that is, something capable of supporting *Modes, Accidents, Relations, or Properties*, which are only different Words, to denote the various *Manners* or *Modes*, by which Existent Beings can raise Ideas in our Minds, or, which is the same Thing, can become knowable by us. Every Existence or Being, I therefore call a *Substance*; the Manner in which it makes an Impression on our Minds, I call a *Mode*; and the Effect or Impression, which is thereby made upon the Mind, I call an *Idea*.

Now

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 3

Now as NOTHING *can have no Properties*, wherever we perceive any Properties, we therefore reasonably conclude, that there must be SOMETHING; that is, some Existence or other to support them. Hence the Maxim laid down by *Spinoza*, *Modi sine Substantia, nec esse, nec concipi possunt*: Or as Sir *Isaac Newton* expresseth it [2], *Virtus sine Substantia subsistere non potest*.

And as God is the only Self-existent Being, therefore he may comparatively speaking, be said to be the only Being in Nature. And accordingly, when *Moses* enquired of God, by what Name he should make him known to the Children of *Israel*, God said, [3] *Thus shalt thou say to the Children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you*. That is, I *that* AM hath sent me unto you; for so it should have been rendered. And therefore, in the first Part of the Verse, where God saith unto *Moses*, *I am that I am*; it should be rendered I AM *that* AM, as it is by the *Septuagint*, *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*, that is, *I am he that is*, or that exists, as if, comparatively speaking, there was no other Being or Existence but God.

[2] Newt. *Princ. Schol. gen.* p. 483. [3] *Exod.* iii. 14.

From which Passage it probably was, that [4] *Plato* borrowed his Notion of the Name of God, when he asserted, that the Word *ἐστίν, est*, is solely applicable to the eternal Nature of God. And from him it also probably was, that the Word *εἶ, i. e. thou art*, was all that was written on the Door of the *Delphic* Temple: Upon which *Plutarch* remarks, that this Word is solely applicable to God, since that which truly *is* must be sempiternal.

All which is true, when we speak of God in a figurative and less correct Manner, only in Comparison with the Creatures that have been made by him; between whom and their Creator there is no Proportion; and which, when considered in Comparison with him, are as *Nothing*. Which is the View that God is to be considered in, as spoken of in the above-mentioned Passages, quoted out of the Books of *Moses*, and the Theological Works of *Plato*.

[4] *Plato*, *Timæus*:

III. But when we speak of God and his Works, in a philosophical and more accurate Manner, this will not hold. Since, as *Des Cartes* truly argues, *I know that I exist*. I cannot be deceived in this. If therefore I exist, and that I am not God, then there is another Existence in Nature beside God. I hope I cannot be thought so absurd, or so impious, as to imagine, that there are more Gods than *one*; or that I did not receive my Existence from the Will and Power of God: The Consciousness of my own Existence necessarily leads me to a first Cause, which first Cause can only be *one*; because two first Causes are a Contradiction in Terms. Every Thing therefore that exists, beside that *First Cause*, which Way soever it is brought forth into Being, whether it be *begotten, emanated, created, or spoken forth*, it must proceed from, and owe its Existence to the [5] Will, as well as Power of that first Cause. However, sure I am, that since I

[5] *Athanasius* acknowledges it to be impious, to say that God the Father was necessitated to act, even when he begat the Son: And allows also that neither the Son nor Holy Spirit are the first Cause; but the Father alone, and that the Son and Holy Spirit were both caused. *Athan.* Vol. I. p. 512. *Id.* Vol. II. p. 442, 443.

6 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT

do exist, I exist as a separate and distinct Existence from God; though not independent of him.

IV. And as my own Consciousness convinces me of my own Existence, so does the same Faculty convince me, that this Existence of mine is composed of two very different Kinds of Existence, that is of a thinking, active, powerful, Existence; and a dull, heavy, inactive, Existence. One of which, to wit, the active, we will, for Distinction sake, without entering into any further metaphysical Disputes about Words, call the spiritual Existence, Subsistence, or Substance; and the other, *viz.* the inactive, we will call the material or bodily Existence; and sometimes, for Brevity sake, we will call one *Spirit*, and the other *Matter* or *Body*.

V. Wherein the Nature or Essence, either of this material or this spiritual Substance does consist, we are entirely ignorant; for we know them only by the Effects or the Influence, which some of their Modes or Properties have upon our Minds. Thus, for Example, though we are capable of perceiving the Hardness, Colour, Figure, &c.

of

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 7

of material Existences; yet are we entirely ignorant, what it is that supports those Properties; or wherein the Nature, Essence, or Identity of *Body* does consist, when the Hardness, Figure, Colour, &c. is either altered or removed. In like Manner, we are equally ignorant of the Nature or Essence of Spirit: We know indeed some of the Properties thereof, such as, Perception Thinking, Willing, Doubting, &c. But we know not the Essence of that spiritual Being within us, which perceives, thinks, wills, or doubts, &c.

VI. And though we know not wherein the Nature or Essence, either of *Body* or Spirit does consist: yet we find by Experience, that is, from the Effects which we feel from within, and from without ourselves, that these two Kinds of Existences, of which the human Constitution is composed, have very different and inconsistent Properties: As for Example, that one has the Power of Motion in itself; whereas the other can neither put itself into Motion, nor put a Stop to its own Motions, when once begun; whence we reasonably conclude, that their Natures or Essence are also different.

8 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

VII. We likewise find, from Experience, that there is a Difference between necessary and voluntary Motion; and that some Agents have a Power of Beginning, varying, and putting a Stop to their own Motions *ad libitum*; while others invariably act after one regular, constant, and uniform Method of proceeding, equally and at all Times. And although it is not easy to determine the Boundaries between those two Species of Beings, the Gradation from the one to the other, in some Instances being so exceedingly exquisite, as for Example, between the vegetable and the animal Part of the Creation, as to render the Distinction hardly perceptible; yet sure we are of the Matter of Fact, *viz.* that there are some Beings, which are capable of voluntary Self-Motion, whereas we find, by Experience, that others are not: And since we find, by repeated Experiments, that that Kind of Existence, which we call *Matter*, is incapable of producing any Kind of Motion, either voluntary or involuntary; whenever we see any thing moved, we may fairly conclude the first Author, or Cause of that Motion, to be what we call *Spirit*.

VIII. It

VIII. It is beyond the Reach of human Abilities to explain, how these two different Kinds of Existence, the active and inactive, can have an Influence, or can possibly affect each other. When we see a Stone descend to the Ground, we are not much surpris'd, because it is common; but certain it is, that the original Cause of that Motion must be some Spirit or other; not only with regard to the Determination of that Motion, but also with regard to the whole *Momentum* of it: Since, as *Nothing can act where it is not*, that Power whereby any Body continues in Motion, is as much the Effect of some concomitant Spirit, as the Power which put it first in Motion.

IX. That Power also, whereby Matter is enabled to *resist* Motion, is as much the Effect of Spirit, as that whereby it is enabled to continue in Motion, when once communicated; Since Matter, as Matter, cannot possibly exert any active Power of any Kind, either in beginning, continuing, or resisting of Motion. It may remain at Rest, by virtue of its own Inactivity; but if no active Power with-held it, a Mountain would be

10 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

as easily moved as a Mole-hill. Because that Resistance, Weight, or Gravity is occasioned by nothing else but the Tendency of one Body towards another, impelled thereto by the attractive Force of some Spirit. Which Tendency, or attractive Power, being in Proportion to the [6] Quantity of Matter, makes the Difference of Weight or Gravity in Bodies. When therefore this Tendency is removed, there will be no Difference in their Gravity; because none of them, whether large or little, will have any at all: And of Consequence; their Power of Resistance will be destroyed. Which plainly proves, that Resistance is something more than bare Inability, or a Want of Power, or a Negation of Spirit, as the Author of [7] *Siris* asserts it only to be.

X. And as there can be no Motion, without a Direction or Determination being

[6] Hactenus phaenomena Cœlorum & Maris nostri per vim Gravitatis exposui; sed causam Gravitatis nondum assignavi. Oritur utique hæc Vis a Causa aliqua, quæ penetrat ad usque Centra Solis & Planetarum sine Virtutis diminutione; quæque agit, non pro quantitate Superficierum Particularum in quas agit, (ut solent causæ mechanicæ) sed pro quantitate Materiae solidæ. Newt. *Princ. Schol. gen.* p. 482.

[7] *Siris*, Sect. 290.

given to that Motion ; hence it will follow, that every Being, capable of moving, either itself, or any thing else, must also be endowed with an *Intellect*, or Understanding, capable of directing that Motion. And as nothing can act where it is not, hence also it is that Attraction, or Gravity, does not operate in proportion to the Superficies of Bodies, but according to the Quantity of Matter ; because every, even the least Particle of active, or attractive Matter, must be directed in its Motions by some Spirit, united to that Matter, which may have just such a Quantity of Intellect communicated to it by its Creator, as will enable it to perform those Functions, which are assigned it by its Creator, in order to carry on the general Oeconomy of this Universe.

Which Functions, all active Beings that are not endowed with a Freedom of Will, must constantly and regularly perform, whenever there is an Opportunity given them of exerting those Faculties. And therefore, if they are appointed to perform the Operations of *Attraction* and *Repulsion*, they must, as necessary Agents, always *attract* or *repel* at certain Distances, and according to
certain

12 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

certain and stated Rules, prescribed by their great Creator ; and will never vary in their Tendency towards this Body, or their Aversion from that ; but will for ever act in one uniform Way of attracting or repelling the same Bodies, and in one regular, constant, Method of Proceeding. From the Observation of which Operations, those Rules, which are called the Laws of Motion, are deduced by the Curious.

XI. All Nature, therefore, seems to be animated, or alive ; and this whole World to be replete with *Spirits* formed with different Kinds and Degrees of Abilities, according to the various Ends and Uses, for which they were designed by their Creator. The Difference of whose intellectual Faculties may not only consist in the Difference of their original Formation as Spirits ; but also in the different Inlets for Knowledge, through the Tegument of that Body to which they are united, and by which the Spirit within is capable of receiving any Kind of Information, for the Improvement of its own Understanding,

But

But if the Almighty is pleased to add a *Liberty of Will* to this active Intellect, and create Spirits endowed with a Power of *voluntary Motion*, then it seems necessary that Almighty God should confer also upon such intelligent Spirits, such Faculties and Powers, as would enable them to be capable of perceiving Pleasure or Pain; since nothing else, but a Sense of one or other of these, seems capable of determining the *Will* to act. For if the Sensation of Pleasure or Pain be removed from the Will, there can be no Reason or Cause for it to prefer one Motion to another, and of consequence, no Direction or Determination.

XII. And hence may be deduced the following Observations: That to such a Being every thing may be called *Good*, that giveth Pleasure; and every thing *Evil*, that produceth Pain. The highest Pleasure, which any Being is capable of enjoying, may be called its *Happiness*; and the highest Pain, *Misery*. Now as the Use of all Pain is to determine our Motions, so that when we feel or fear Pain, we may be thereby excited to new Actions, for our own Preservation

fervation and Delight; hence it appears, that *Evil* takes its *Origin* from the Goodness of God, in which it will also be finally absorbed, when Pain shall be no more. The Will cannot be at Liberty to chuse Evil as Evil. But as Pain may be productive of Pleasure, or Pleasure be productive of Pain, hence it comes to pass, that free Agents, by being deceived, through their Ignorance or Passions, may chuse Evil under the Appearance of Good; and herein consists human Freedom; not in the Power of chusing Evil, but in the Power of chusing what seems Good from among a Variety of *Good*, whether real or apparent: And herein lies the Difference between the Freedom of God and of Man; that as fallible Men may chuse an apparent Good, instead of a real one, they, by being liable to be deceived, are free, by that Means, to chuse Evil, instead of Good: Whereas God, who cannot be deceived, is only free to chuse out of that infinite Variety of real Good, which his Will and his Wisdom may dictate.— And lastly, That Virtue, Wisdom, Prudence, &c. in Mankind, may be considered only as various Names, for the several Powers given to them, and the different

Methods

Methods used by them in the Attainment of Happiness, and avoiding of Misery. And hence also Self-Love may be looked upon, in Nature, as the Principle of all voluntary Action; and the Foundation of all *Morality*.

XIII. We find, by Experience, that there are some voluntary self-moving Beings here upon Earth, which have but one or two Methods of furnishing their Minds with the Sense of Pleasure, or of Pain; others have three; others four; others five; which are commonly known by the Name of *Senses*; to which rational Beings have one more added, which is that of inward Reflection. And therefore, the Author of the Book of *Ecclesiasticus*, speaking of the Formation of Mankind, says [8], *They received the Use of the five Operations of the Lord, and in the sixth Place he imparted to them Understanding.*

XIV. But let their Number be never so various, they may, in general, be reduced to these two. First, those Methods of Information, which the Mind of any Being,

[8] Ecclus xvii. 6.

16 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

composed of Body and Spirit, is capable of being affected with, by the Intervention of the Senses; which furnish the Mind with such Ideas as may be called the *Ideas of Sensation*, because they are conveyed to the Mind through the Organs of Sensation. Or, secondly, those Methods of Information, which the Spirit of any self-moving Agent is capable of being affected with, by its own reflex Acts upon itself; by the Means of which, the Mind is furnished with such Ideas, as may properly be called *Ideas of Reflection*.

XV And indeed it is in these reflex Acts of the human Spirit, that is, in the Power which the human Spirit is endowed with, first, in perceiving its own internal Operations in Thinking; and, secondly, in being able to turn back its perceptive Faculty, to its past Perceptions, that the chief Difference seems to consist, between the Spirit of Man, and the Spirit of Brutes; or between the rational, and that which is commonly called the Animal, Creation.

XVI. By the Assistance, however, of these two Faculties, that is, of *Sensation* and *Reflection*

flexion, the Spirit of Man is furnished with all those Ideas, which fill the human Mind ; and supply it with Objects of *intellectual*, as well as sensual Pleasures. The latter of which it is, that strikes us soonest and strongest, as being most necessary for the immediate Use, and Preservation of Life. And accordingly, we find, that the human Mind requires a kind of Ripening, before it is capable of making any reflex Acts upon its own Operations, or having any Relish for intellectual Pleasures. Upon which Account it must be acknowledged to have been one great Advantage, which *Adam* had over all his Posterity, that his intellectual Faculties came with him into the World in their full Force ; by which Means, he was free from that Bias in favour of sensual Pleasures, which all his Offspring have, ever since, necessarily, laboured under, by an Habit of being indulged in sensual Gratifications, from their Infancy ; till they come to a Maturity of Judgment ; during which whole Time, the human Will hath no Relish for any Pleasures, but such as enter in by the Senses.

XVII. The Spirit of Man, therefore, being furnished with Ideas by the Operation of the two Faculties of *Sensation* and *Reflexion*; when the Mind begins to operate a-new, its Operations are called by different Names, according to the different Use it makes of those Ideas. For when the Spirit retains any Ideas in View, and collates, or compares, them together, this Act of the Spirit is called *Thinking*. The Continuation of which Act is called *Attention*. When it deposits its Ideas in the Store-House, or Treasury, of the Mind, for future Recollection, and produces them back, upon Occasion, in the same Manner as they were deposited; this Act is called *Memory*: But when it varies, alters, and compounds them, so that they are not the same, as when deposited; this Act is called *Imagination*.

XVIII. When the Spirit, by collating and comparing Ideas together, finds out the Agreement, or Disagreement, of those Ideas; this Operation produceth *Knowledge*, and is, by the Logicians, called *Judgment*: But when the Spirit is mistaken in this Operation,

tion, and imagines Ideas to have an Agreement, which have no Agreement, and, *vice versa*, this Operation produceth *Error*.

XIX. When this Agreement, or Disagreement, of Ideas, strikes the Mind at once, without the Intervention of any third Idea, to prove their Agreement, or Disagreement with one another; this is *intuitive Knowledge*: Which is so called, from its Resemblance to the Information, which the Mind receives by the Sensation of Sight; because it perceives those Kinds of Truth, as the Eye does Light, only by being directed to them: The Objects of which are those Propositions, that are called *self-evident Truths*: Such as, that two and two make four; that the Whole is greater than a Part; that Happiness is preferable to Misery, &c. which the Mind cannot but assent to, as soon as it is made to understand the Meaning of those Terms, and which can no more be proved, or demonstrated, than simple Ideas can be defined; as being themselves the Foundation of all Knowledge and Demonstration.

XX. But when the Mind is employed in a more complicated Operation, that is, in comparing together those *Relations*, or this Knowledge which we have acquired of the Agreement, or Disagreement of our Ideas; or, which is the same thing, when the Mind, by comparing the Propositions, which result from the Agreement, or Disagreement, of our Ideas, from thence deduces certain *Conclusions*; this Operation of the Spirit, is called *Reasoning*.

The Necessity and Laboriousness of which Operation, in order to arrive at Truth, shews the Imperfection of human Nature; since we find, by Experience, that there is but a very small Part of Knowledge, which is so self-evident to us, as to be *intuitive*. Whereas Beings of a superior Nature, have, probably, their intuitive Knowledge enlarged, in proportion to the Excellency of their Natures: By which Means, those Degrees of Knowledge, which human Beings are groping after, by long and tedious Deductions of Reason, are open, at once, to the Eyes of their Understanding, and strike them, at once, with an intuitive
View;

View ; which is always the more extensive, in proportion to the Excellency of their Natures.

XXI. And hence it is, that [9] *Plato*, speaking of human Abilities in the Investigation of Truth, calls it, *beholding Things in the Glass of Reason* : Which he explains, by saying, That as they who contemplate an Eclipse of the Sun, lose the Sight of it, unless they are so careful as to view its Reflexion in Water, or to look at it through some Medium, such as thick Glass ; so the Eye of an human Spirit is too weak to find out Truth, unless it looks at it through the Medium of Reason ; which *St. Paul* also calls [1] *seeing through a Glass darkly*.

XXII. We do indeed see through a Glass darkly, by the Means of this Tegument of Flesh ; this earthly Tabernacle, that encompasseth our Spirit : Since it is manifest, that the intelligent Spirit within Man is, in itself, endowed with Faculties, greatly superior to those Powers it exerciseth in the human Understanding ; and performs many

[9] *Plato* in *Phædo*.

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

22 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

Operations within us, and upon us, that are not only above our Power to direct, but above our Understanding to comprehend. That Power, which is constantly working within us, to form and preserve the regular Disposition of our bodily Organs, and to change the Food which we eat, into Blood, into Flesh, and into Bones; and which, according to the Naturalists, is said always to work most powerfully, when the human Understanding is asleep, is manifestly above our Comprehension.

XXIII. It is a common Observation, that when the Belly is full, the Bones would be at rest; which seems entirely owing to this, that the Spirit, being unmolested with human Cogitations, and its Attendance upon our Will, may be more at leisure to pursue those Operations, which are immediately necessary towards our Preservation. For that it is the same wise Agent, which operates in the Digestion of our Food, and that enables us to put in Execution the Directions of our Will, appears from hence, that when we have a Mind to move a Finger, or a Leg, that Part of the human Understanding, which is under our Direction,

is

is capable of doing no more than the Power of willing it ; but how to perform this Action, it is as ignorant of as the Beast in the Field.

XXIV. Which Operation of the Spirit, is that which is known by the Name of *Instinct*, and goes through the whole Creation. It is by *Instinct* that the minutest Particles of Matter attract or repel each other : It is by *Instinct* that the Flower of the Field, which out-does *Solomon* in all his Glory, is directed in throwing forth its Leaves and its Flowers, and forming its Fruit in due Season : It is by *Instinct* that the Birds of the Air build their Nests ; and the Beasts of the Field provide for themselves and their Young, with a Sagacity superior to the Directions of human Wisdom.

XXV. Whether the Spirits of all created Beings or even of all Beings of the same Species, are equally perfect, is a Question not very easy to determine ; because, though we find, by Experience, a vast Difference, between the Understandings of Men, not only with regard to their improved, but also their natural Abilities ; yet this may arise, not from any Difference between the

Spirits of Men, but from the different Formation of their bodily Organs ; which may have that Influence upon their Spirit, as sufficiently to account for the Difference of their Understandings : Since we frequently see bodily Distempers, such as Frenzies and Fevers, make such an Alteration in the Understanding, as to reduce Men, at other Times of good and sensible Dispositions at least, to the Level, with Madmen and Idiots.

XXVI. And therefore we cannot be positive, but that all created Spirits, may only differ, according to the different Combinations of that material System, with which they are circumscribed, and in which they are enclosed, by the great Author of Nature. For, as Extension seems to be a Property peculiar to material Substance, it may be, that all created Spirits, do not only owe their Shape, and the Limits of their Existence, to Matter, but also the Extent of those Faculties, which they are permitted to exert. And that the same Spirit, which, when cloathed with one Set of material Organs, is only capable of exerting its Intelligence in the Performance of Attraction or

Repul-

Repulsion, and when jarring Elements meet, breaks forth in Thunder and Lightning, and Earthquakes, or any other mechanical Operations, may, when united to a different Sett of Organs, of a more exquisite and delicate Contexture, be capable of exercising voluntary Motion, may be enabled to think and to reason, to operate in Love or Hatred, and, when provoked by Opposition, may be agitated with Anger and Resentment, and break forth in Quarrels, Contention, and War.

XXVII. What other Spirits there are in the Universe, beside those which belong to this terraqueous Globe, and how or when they came into Existence, human Understandings are not capable of pointing out : But more than probable it is, that the great Expanse is full of Spirits of different Ranks and Degrees, from the lowest Power of Activity to the highest Degree of Perfection, which it is possible for created Spirits to be possessed of.

XXVIII. To what Degree of Perfection Spirits are capable of being created, human Knowledge cannot possibly determine : But
certain

26 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

certain it is, that the Degree must be limited in every Being, but God alone ; and that God cannot create or produce any Being, equal in Power to, or independent on, himself ; because two All-powerfuls, two Supremes, would imply a Contradiction.

XXIX. We may, however, easily suppose, that God may communicate to the Works of his Hands, such Portions of his own Attributes, as are greatly beyond the Comprehension of Mankind to conceive : Because God can do every Thing that does not imply a Contradiction. For, as a blind Man cannot apprehend how a Shepherd, from the Top of an Hill, can preside over several Flocks of Sheep, wandering about, at a Distance from each other ; how he knows when they stray, or how, by the Help of his Eye-sight, he can be, as it were, omnipresent : So a Man of the greatest Abilities may, for Want of Faculties, be unable to conceive that Power, whereby a created intelligent Agent, of superior Qualifications to those communicated to Mankind, can be enabled to see in Darkness as well as Light ; to know the inmost Recesses and Thoughts of Mens Hearts ; to preside at
once

once over such a World as this which we inhabit, and where two or three are gathered together, there to be also invisible in the Midst of them : And yet such a Power may certainly be communicated, because it implies no Contradiction.

XXX. In like Manner, therefore, as we see Mankind furnished with Abilities to contrive and form several Machines of wonderful Force and Efficacy ; to build Houses and Ships, make Clocks and Watches ; and govern Kingdoms : So there seems to be no Contradiction, in supposing that God might communicate so much Power to one of his own Creatures, of a more exalted Nature than Man, as to enable him to create inferior Beings, and frame a World of his own, composed of intelligent Agents : Which Power, however must be limited, and must be dependent on the Supreme Being.

XXXI. And, as the Almighty God is the only supreme, infinite, unlimited, Being in the Universe ; so is he, probably, the only unembodied Spirit that exists : That is, the only Spirit which is not limited, clogged, and fettered, with some Kind, or Degree,
of

inactive Matter, which may serve to give a Form and Shape, or Boundary, to its spiritual Nature. For [2] *there are Bodies celestial, and Bodies terrestrial; but the Glory of the celestial is one, and the Glory of the terrestrial is another.* And as we know not what the Essence of that inactive Principle is, which we call *Matter*, we cannot say, to what exquisite Degrees of Perfection its Properties are reducible, or what Improvement it is capable of receiving; but that some [3] Spirits may be furnished with Bodies of so delicate a Texture, that they may *cloath themselves with Light, as it were with a Garment, may make the Clouds their Chariots, and walk upon the Wings of the Wind:* By the organical Disposition of which Bodies, the Spirits united thereto may be capable of receiving and communicating to

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 40.

[3] Most of the ancient Fathers supposed the Angels to have Bodies. See Clemens Alex. *Pædag.* xli. p. 101. as also Huetii *Origeniana*, lib. ii. c. 2, 5. Tertullian was so absurd, as to suppose even God to have a Body, *Tert. de Carne Christi*, cap. 11. which I suppose he borrowed from the old Platonic Notion, of God being the Soul of the World. But this God, he ought to have considered, was not supposed to be the Supreme God. See Plato in *Timæo*: See also Virg. *Æneid.* lib. vi. 721.

each other Ideas of bodily Pain and bodily Pleasure, as well as intellectual Pain and intellectual Pleasure; may have their Affections and their Passions as well as we; their Friendships and Animosities; their Wars and Alliances; none of which, however, we can form any real Idea, or Notion of, for Want of the same Kind of Senses, which they are furnished with; any more than a deaf Man can of Sounds, or a blind Man can of Light and Colours.

XXXII. And, as to the Time when they were created, we are as ignorant of that, as we are of their Natures. But probable it is, that as God is an active Spirit, for *God is a Spirit*, and hath existed from all Eternity, he hath been constantly employed in exerting this active Faculty; and therefore may have created some intelligent Beings, from such a distant Duration of Time, as we can no otherwise describe but by calling it *eternal*. For to imagine that there are no Spirits in the wide Expanse of Space, but what have Reference to this terraqueous Globe, this Speck of Matter, on which Mankind are placed, or even this planetary System, which is visible to human Eyes;
and

and that no Worlds, filled with intelligent Spirits, were created till about 6000 Years ago ; about which Time, both Reason and Revelation agree, that this Ball of Earth began to revolve about the Sun, is a Thought unworthy of a Philosopher, and inconsistent with the Infinity of God's Power, as well as with the Eternity of his Existence.

XXXIII. And yet we ought to take Notice, that in the Language of the Scriptures, both in the Old and New Testament, when the *Creation* is spoken of, it is only to be considered as referring to the Creation of this World, in which there is no Mention made of the Creation of Angels, or of any other Beings, because it would have been foreign to the Purpose : And that therefore, St. *John* begins his Gospel with the same Expression that *Moses* does ; *In the Beginning*, i. e. of this World. For when we speak of any Beings, which existed before this World was created, having no Measures of Time, whereby to denote, or distinguish the different Durations of their Existence, we must equally say of them all, that they existed [4] *in the Beginning*, or *before the*

[4] Gen. i. 1. John i. 1. xvii. 5. Psal. cii. 5. Prov. viii. 22, 23. Micah v. 2.

World was, or of old, or from Everlasting.
See Sect. L. LI. LII.

XXXIV. And as God may communicate what Proportions he pleases of his Attributes, to the different Gradations of created Beings, with which he hath been pleased to fill the Universe: Each of these, with regard to Beings of their own Species, may have such Faculties and Properties communicated to them, as may render them knowable to each other. But, with regard to Beings of a different Nature, those of a superior, or more excellent Kind, may not be cognisable, by Beings of an inferior Order; though Beings of an inferior Kind may be easily cognisable to those of a more exalted Nature; the Properties of the one being of too exquisite and delicate a Frame and Contexture, to affect the Perception or strike the Senses of the other. And hence it is, that human Beings may be surrounded with Myriads of spiritual Agents, without ever being sensible thereof; unless those superior Beings are pleased to assume such Forms, and condescend to furnish themselves with such Qualifications, as are capable of making an Impression on the human Spirit

Spirit from within, or the human Senses from without.

XXXV. *Hesiod*, one of the first *Heathen* Authors extant, supposeth Myriads of invifible Spirits cloathed in Air, attending upon this terrestrial Globe, and employed as *Angels*, that is, *Messengers*, between the great God and Mankind, observing their Actions, and reporting them to *Jupiter*. And [5] *Plato* fays, that “ *Saturn* well knowing
 “ there was no Man who could have
 “ absolute Empire over others, without
 “ abandoning himfelf to all Kinds of Violence and Injuftice, fubjected the Nations
 “ not to Men, but to more noble and excellent Beings, as their Lords and Governors ; namely to [6] *Dæmons*, or intelligent Spirits, of a more divine and better Nature than themfelves, after the
 “ fame Manner, as we deal with our Cat-

[5] *Plato*, *de Leg.* lib. iv.

[6] Ἄλλα γένος δεισιόεσ τε καὶ αἰμίονοι, Δαίμονας. By the Word *Dæmon*, we are not to underftand *Evil-Spirits*, as it hath been vulgarly thought to mean ; but rather *happy* ones, the Word Δαίμων, *Dæmon*, originally fignifying *happy*. But as thofe Spirits to which the *Heathen* gave the Appellation of *happy*, have been deemed by *Chriftians* to be rather unhappy and evil Spirits ; therefore this Word is generally mifapplied.

tle :

“tle : For, as we do not set a Bull over
 “a whole Herd of his own Kind, nor a
 “Goat to govern a Flock of Goats ; but
 “put those of both Kinds, under the Con-
 “duct of a Man ; so God, who loves
 “Mankind, placed them, at first, under
 “the Conduct of Angels.”

XXXVI. The [7] *Greeks*, it is certain, and *Plato*, in particular, borrowed many of their theological Sentiments from the *Hebrews* ; among whom this, of a Number of invifible Spirits attending upon this Globe of Earth, and prefiding over States and Kingdoms, was certainly one. For the Opinion of the *Jews* upon this Head was, that Almighty God, the first Author and Creator of all Things, was of fo transcendent a Nature, that, before he created Beings of the loweft Rank, he produced an infinite Variety of Beings, in a gradual Defcent, which were ftill greater and fuperior to others, who yet were employed by him to act in a middle Station, between him and the lower Productions of his Almighty Power. The Septuagint Tranflation of the Bible therefore renders that Paffage in

[7] See Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* p. 507.

the Song of *Moses*, which is mentioned, *Deut.* xxxii. 8, 9. after this Manner: *Ask thy Father, and he will shew thee; thy Elders, and they will tell thee: When the Most High divided to the Nations their Inheritance; When he separated the Sons of Adam, he set the Bounds of the Nations according to the Number of the Angels of God, and the Lord's Portion is his People Jacob, the [8] Line of his Inheritance Israel.* And the wise Son of *Sirach* saith [9], *For in the Division of the Nations of the whole Earth, God set a Ruler (or Governing Angel) over every People; but Israel is the Lord's Portion.* The *Jews* accordingly supposed some of these Angels to have been appointed as Guardian or Governing Spirits [1], over the several Nations of the Earth; and that the Portion of *Israel* was particularly committed to the Care of that Being, who is here denoted by the Name of *the Lord*.

[8] Or *Boundary*. See 1 *Cor.* x. 16.

[9] *Ecclus.* xvii. 17.

[1] It appears also from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, that this was the Opinion of the *Christian Church* in his Time. See *Clem. Alex. Strom.* p. 309, 822, 828, 830, 832. Edit. *Oxon. Pot.*

XXXVII. It ought to be acknowledged, however, that the Words here quoted out of the Book of *Deuteronomy*, as rendered by the Septuagint, do not exactly agree with the *Hebrew* Copy of the Bible. For, according to the *Hebrew*, it should run thus: *When the Most High divided the Nations, when he separated the Sons of Adam, he set the Bounds of the Nations according to the Number of the Children of Israel, and JEHOVAH's Portion is his People: Jacob is the Lot of his Inheritance.* But it should be observed, that although this Separation, or Dispersion of the Sons of *Adam*, this settling the Bounds of the Nations, was a Transaction which came to pass long before *Israel* had any Children to number, or was even himself in Being; yet the Commentators have taken much Pains to reconcile this Text with the Matter of Fact; and to make the Number of the various Nations upon Earth, agree with the Number of the Children of *Israel*; which, nevertheless, they have not been able to accomplish: For, if the Number of the Children of *Israel* be computed by the Number of his immediate Descendants, which were

only thirteen, viz. twelve Sons, and one Daughter ; this Number would be too few for the Number of Nations dispersed over the Earth ; and if all the Descendents of *Israel* be taken into the Account, then the Number will be infinitely too large. As therefore the reading of this Text according to the Septuagint Version, is supported by that Passage, already quoted, out of the Book of *Ecclesiasticus*, as well as by other Parts of the Old Testament ; and corresponds with the general Opinion of the most learned antient *Jews* : I am inclined to prefer the Septuagint Version of this Text, to the present Reading in our *Hebrew* Bible.

XXXVIII. And what adds no small Weight with me in this Affair, is an Expression made use of by [2] *St. Paul*, in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, where, speaking of the second coming of our Saviour, when he shall appear in a State of Glory, manifestly superior to Angels, he says, *For unto the Angels hath he not put in Subjection the World to come, of which we speak.* Whence it seems to appear, that it was *St. Paul's*

[2] Heb. ii. 5.

Opinion, that this present World had been put in Subjection to Angels.

XXXIX. Which Opinion is also confirmed by St. *Jude*, who seems to attribute the Error of the fallen Angels, who *sinned* as (3) St. *Peter* expresseth it, to their Misconduct in the Government of those Provinces which were allotted to their Charge. For, says he, Ἀγγέλους τε τὰς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας, δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν. *The Angels which kept not their Principalities with due Care; but neglected their proper Provinces, he (God) hath reserved in everlasting Chains under Darknefs:* For so this Verse ought to be translated. The Verb τηρέω, which we translate *kept*, signifying the keeping of a Thing with Care and Diligence: In which Sense it is used, when it is applied in the Septuagint to the (4) keeping the Commandments of God, and keeping our own Hearts, and our Ways. And in *Canticles* vii. 11, 12, it is used to denote the *Keepers* of a Vineyard, who

[3] 2 Pet. ii. 4.

[4] 1 Sam. xv. 11. Prov. iii. 1, 21. iv. 23. viii. 34.

38 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

were to dress it, and cultivate it. And as to the Word Ἀρχή, that is generally used by the Septuagint to denote a *Principality*, as the Word is rendered in the Margin of our *English* Bible. And it is to be observed, that it is the Word Ἀρχων and Ἀρχοντες, which *Daniel* gives to those ruling Angels, which are said, in the Book of [5] *Daniel*, to preside over the Realms of *Græcia*, *Persia* and *Israel*. The Word ἀπολείπω, which our Translation renders *left*, is frequently applied by the Septuagint, to denote the leaving or neglecting any Business, which it was our Duty to have pursued; as when [6] *Baasha* is said to have *left off building Ramah*, and let his Work cease; and when *Solomon* blameth the [7] *strange Woman*, for FORSAKING the Guide of her Youth. The Word οἰκητήριον, though it properly signifies a *Dwelling-place*, in general, yet it is not confined to signify a House, nor even a Province, or larger Space of Ground; but is by the Prophet [8] *Jeremiah* applied to denote the wide Extent of God's holy Habitation in Heaven: However, it is here restrained by the Word ἴδιον, to

[5] Dan. x. 13, 20, 21. xii. 1. [6] 2 Chron. xvi. 5.
[7] Prov. ii. 17. [8] Jer. xxv. 30.

denote

denote the proper and peculiar Provinces of these Angels, which they may be supposed to have been employed in the Conduct and Management of; and accordingly the Word *οικέτης* denotes such a Domestick as is employed in the Business of the House, and is always used by the Septuagint to signify a [9] *Servant*. And therefore this Expression of *Ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον*, may very well be understood to signify their forsaking, or neglecting, their proper Business, or Provinces, that were given into their Charge by God.

XL. As for the Opinion of the more modern *Jews*, it is no easy Matter to collect or fix their Sentiments; because that, since the coming of our Saviour, the *Jews*, not being willing to abide by the Explications given to the Prophecies in the Old Testament, by the *Christians*, or even by their own ancient Paraphrasts, made a Collection of their oral Traditions, which they gathered together into one Book, which they called the *Talmud*: And finding many seeming Contradictions in the literal Interpretation of those Texts of Scripture, which

[9] Gen. ix. 25. xxvii. 37. xlv. 33, &c.

were universally allowed by the ancient *Jews* to refer to their Messiah; and not being willing to expound them of different Advents of one and the same Person; the one in a State of Humiliation, and the other in a State of Glory; the one in this World, and the other in the next; they then ran into numberless absurd Contrivances, of expounding the Scriptures by a cabalistical Method of Interpretation, in finding out mysterious and hidden Meanings, not only in the Sentences and Words of Scripture, but also in the very Letters themselves, as well as in the Number of Letters, of which those Words were composed: And, by this Means, the Learning of the more modern *Jews* is reduced into such a nonsensical Jargon of Sounds, without Sense, as makes their Works infinitely tiresome in the Perusal. And therefore, rather than fatigue my Reader with an Account of such Trifles, I shall chuse to lay before him the Opinion of the most sensible and learned among the ancient *Jews*, as I find it collected very judiciously, by *Eusebius* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*, who must be allowed to be a tolerable Judge, because he lived amongst them in the Land of *Judæa*.

XLI. [1] “ The *Jews*, says he, after
 “ that Effence of the All powerful God,
 “ who had neither Beginning nor Origin,
 “ place that [2] *Head* or *Chief*, which was
 “ begotten of the Father, and therefore
 “ was his First-born. Which, as he is
 “ the Co-adjutor of his Council, is there-
 “ fore called the Image of his Father.
 “ Which *Chief*, as he far exceeds all crea-
 “ ted Beings, is for this Reason called *the*
 “ *Image of God*, the *Wisdom of God*, the
 “ *Logos*, or *Word of God*, the *Prince of*
 “ *the Lord's Host*, and the *Angel of his*
 “ *Council*. As to those Intelligences, which
 “ come after this *Chief*, they are of such
 “ various and different Forms, that human
 “ Expressions cannot denote them, but by
 “ Comparifon and Analogy to those Things
 “ which are the Objects of our Senses;
 “ as the Sun, the Moon, the Stars, and
 “ the Heaven, which enclofeth all Things.
 “ As the divine Apostle does, when he fays,

[1] Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. vii. cap. 15.

[2] Ἀρχῆς, which Word is sometimes used by the Authors of the Septuagint Version of the Bible, instead of Ἀρχων, to denote the *Head*, or *Chief*, of any Society, or collective Body of Men. See *Exod.* vi. 25.

“ *There*

42 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

“ *There is one Glory of the Sun, and another*
 “ *Glory of the Moon, and another Glory of*
 “ *the Stars, for one Star differeth from ano-*
 “ *ther Star in Glory.* In like Manner,
 “ must we think of the Subordination of
 “ unbodied, intelligent, Beings. For, as
 “ the ineffable and infinite Power of God
 “ (*like Heaven*) comprehends all Things;
 “ in the second Place comes the operating
 “ and illuminating Power of the divine
 “ *Logos*; for which Reason he is called by
 “ the *Hebrews*, the *Light*, and the [3] *Sun*
 “ of *Justice*: Then, after this [4] second
 “ Essence, as it were in the Place of the
 “ *Moon*, comes the *Holy Spirit*, which they
 “ place in this royal Dignity, and Degree of
 “ [5] *Principality*; because it is the Will of
 “ the great Architect to appoint him to
 “ the *Principality* of those inferior Beings,
 “ which may want his Assistance. Who
 “ therefore, obtaining the third Place,
 “ confers on those who are inferior to him,
 “ those excellent Virtues, which he himself
 “ received from another, to wit, from the
 “ divine *Logos*, his Better and Superior;

[3] Mal. iv. 2. Which *Philo Judæus* interprets of the
Messiah. [4] Δευτέραν ὑστάτην. [5] Ἀρχὴς.

who

“ who we before said was the second to
 “ the supreme, unbegotten, and Almighty,
 “ God.—So, says he, all the *Hebrew* Divines,
 “ after that God, who is over all, and after
 “ his first-born Wisdom, pay [6] divine
 “ Worship to the third and holy Power,
 “ which they call the Holy Spirit, by which
 “ they themselves are illuminated, when
 “ they are divinely inspired.”

XLII. In another Place, [7] *Eusebius*,
 in explaining the Sentiments of the *Jews*,
 says, that, “ as *Milesius* made a second
 “ Principle of *Water*; *Heraclitus* of *Fire*;
 “ and *Pythagoras* of *Numbers*, &c; so the
 “ *Jews* made a second Essence of the *Lo-*
 “ *gos*, which was begotten by the *First*
 “ *Cause*.”

XLIII. And in another Place, [8] *Eusebius*
 quotes a Passage of *Philo Judæus*,
 wherein that Author calls the *Logos*, the
 [9] *Second God*, in whose Image Man was
 created. And again, where he calls this

[6] Αποθειάζουσιν. [7] *Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. vii. cap.*
 12. [8] *Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. vii. cap. 13.* [9] Δέυ-
 τερον Θεόν.

44. AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

Logos, The first-born Son of God, to whom God had committed the Care of all Things, [1] as a great King appoints a Minister, or Viceroy, to act under him.

XLIV. And, in another Place, [2] he quotes *Philo*, for calling this *Second Cause* the Image of God, the first-born *Logos*, the most antient of Angels, and, as it were, the Archangel, subsisting with many Names. For says *Philo*, He is called the [3] Chief, the Name of God, the *Logos*, the Image, and the [4] Overseer, Visiter, or Regarder of Israel.

XLV. I am very sensible, that some learned Men are of Opinion, that these were only the Sentiments of the *Jews* belonging to *Palestine* and *Egypt*; but if we look into those Books, which contain the Doctrines, which all *Jews* either do, or ought to profess, that is, the Scriptures of the Old Testament, we shall find that there is great Foundation for the afore-mentioned Opinions of the *Jews*, with regard to Angels;

[1] Οἷα τις μεγάλη βασιλείᾳ παρὰ τοῦ διὰ τοῦτο.

[2] Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. xi. cap. 15. Περὶ τῶν δυνάμεων αἰτίᾳ. [3] Ἀρχή. [4] Ὁ ὁρῶν Ἰσραὴλ.

and

and for all these Appellations, which are here given to this *secondary Essence*, who is, by *Philo*, very justly called *the Archangel with many Names*. For the Prophet [5] *Daniel* declares, that the Angel *Gabriel*, having touched him, and spoken to him, said, that he was come to make him understand what should befall his People in the latter Days, and that he would have come sooner, but that [6] *the Prince* (or ruling or governing Angel) of the Kingdom of Persia withstood him one and twenty Days, till Michael, one of the chief Princes, or, as the Hebrew expresseth it, the FIRST PRINCE, came to help him. And again the Angel says, *And now I will return to fight against the Prince of Persia, and when I am gone forth, lo the Prince of Græcia shall come. But I will shew thee what is noted in the Scripture of Truth; and there is none that holdeth with me in these Things, but MICHAEL your Prince*. And a little afterwards he calleth MICHAEL the great Prince which standeth for the Children of Israel. Or, as *Philo*

[5] Dan. viii. 16. ix. 21. x. 13, 20, 21. xii. 1.

[6] Heb. 72. Sept. *Αρχων. *Simmias*, the Disciple of *Socrates*, in *Plato's Phædo*, speaking of Guardian Angels, calls them Δεσποτᾶς, i. e. Lords, or Governors.

would

would have expressed it, ὁ ὄρων Ἰσραήλ :
*He that regardeth, or is the Guardian An-
 gel of, Israel.*

XLVI. And correspondent hereto the Septuagint Translation of the Bible, as before quoted, renders that Passage in the Song of *Moses*, which is mentioned, *Deut. xxxii. 8, 9, Ask thy Father, and he will shew thee; thy Elders, and they will tell thee: When the Most High divided to the Nations their Inheritance; when he separated the Sons of Adam, he set the Bounds of the Nations according to the Number of the Angels of God, and the LORD's Portion is his People Jacob, the Line of his Inheritance Israel.* Upon which Words *Eusebius* has this Remark. [7] “ By the Words *the Most High*, *Moses* denotes the Father, who is “ God over all; and by *the Lord*, he means “ the *Logos*, who is called *Lord*, as being, “ with regard to us, next to that God who “ is over all. But, says he, all Nations “ whom he calls the Sons of *Adam*, were, “ for Reasons to us unsearchable, distribu- “ ted according to the Will of the Most “ High, to Governing and Guardian An-

[7] *Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. iv. cap. 7.*

“ gels,

“ gels, who elude our Sight. But to the
 “ most eminent Governor, Ruler, and King
 “ of all, as to his only Son, he allots the
 “ Government of *Jacob*, or *Israel*.” And
 in this Interpretation he is supported by *Cle-*
mens Alexandrinus, who says positively, that
 [8] *Angels were appointed by God to preside*
over Nations and Cities: That [9] they
are his Ministers in the Government of ter-
restrial Affairs; and, [1] in particular, that
they were by his Command distributed among
the Nations, &c.

XLVII. Whence it is manifest, that, ac-
 cording to the Scriptures of the Old Testa-
 ment, Angels were appointed to preside
 over People and Nations upon Earth, and
 that one Angel, in particular, who is called,
 by *Moses* [2], *Jehovah*, and by the Septua-
 gint is translated *the Lord*, had *Israel* assign-
 ed to him by the *Most High*, as the Portion
 of his Inheritance; and therefore may very
 reasonably be supposed to be the same Person
 with that *first Prince*, mentioned by *Daniel*,

[8] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* lib. vi. p. 822. Edit. Pot.

[9] Id. *ibid.* lib. vii. p. 839. [1] Id. *ibid.* p. 832.

[2] See Sect. xxxvii.

whom

48 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

whom he also calleth MICHAEL, *the great Prince which standeth for the Children of Israel*; and with that Archangel with many Names, whom *Philo* calls *the Regarder of Israel*.

XLVIII. And what is remarkable, is this, that this Name of *Michael*, which is given by *Daniel* to this Archangel, literally signifies [3] *who is like God*; and accordingly *Philo* observes, that one of the Names belonging to this Archangel, was *the Image of God*. Which Image [4] he calleth the *Logos* and *the second God*, and supposed Man to have been made in the Image of this Image; Because, says he, “ nothing
“ mortal can be formed in the Image of
“ the Supreme God, the Father of all
“ Things.”

XLIX. Which *Logos*, or *Word* of God, is, in the *Book of Wisdom*, manifestly spoken of, as the Guardian Angel of *Israel*; where the Author of that elegant Work, in

[3] The Word *Michael*, being derived from the three Hebrew Words, *Mi*, which signifies *who*; *Cha*, which signifies *so*, or *like*, or *the same*; and *El*, which signifies *God*.

[4] Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. vii. cap. 13.

describing

describing the [5] Angel, who was sent to rescue them from their *Egyptian* Bondage, by destroying the First-born of the *Egyptians*, says: For [6] *while all Things were in quiet Silence, and that Night was in the Midst of her swift Course, thine Almighty WORD leapt down from Heaven, out of thy royal Throne, as a fierce Man of War into the Midst of a Land of Destruction, and brought thy unfeigned Commandment, as a sharp Sword, and standing up, filled all Things with Death, and it touched the Heaven, but it stood upon the Earth. And therefore also the Jerusalem Targum on Exod. xii. 23. where it is said in the Hebrew, And JEHOVAH will pass through to smite the Egyptians, paraphrases it by saying, And the WORD OF JEHOVAH shall pass through to smite the Egyptians. Which Expression of Memra Jehovæ, or Word of Jehovah, is so favourite an Expression, among all the Chaldee Paraphrasts on the Old Testament, that, where the original Expression in the Hebrew says, Jehovah did such or such a Thing, they commonly paraphrase it, by attributing those Operations to*

[5] Exod. xxiii. 21. [6] Wisd. xviii. 13—16.

50 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

the *Memra*, that is, the *Logos*, or *Word* of Jehovah. Instances of which it would be endless to produce.

L. And as this Angel, whose Portion is *Israel*, is called the *Word* of God, because God employeth him to carry his Word; so is he also, by the same Figure of Rhetoric, called *the Wisdom of God*, because he is employed by God to execute the Purposes of his Wisdom. For thus the wise Son of *Sirach*, when speaking of this Guardian Angel of *Israel*, by the Name of *Wisdom*, says [7], *I came out of the Mouth of the High, and covered the Earth as a Cloud. I dwelt in high Places, and my Throne is in a cloudy Pillar. So the Creator of all Things gave me a Commandment; and he that MADE me caused me to rest, and said, Let thy Dwelling be in Jacob, and thine Inheritance in Israel. He CREATED me from the Beginning, before the World, and I shall never fail. In the holy Tabernacle I served him; and so was I established in Sion. Likewise in the beloved City he gave me Rest, and in Jerusalem was my Power. And I took Root in an honou-*

[7] *Ecclus* xxiv. 1—12.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 51

vable People, even in the Portion of the Lord's Inheritance. I therefore being ETERNAL, am given to all my Children which are named of him, i. e. I am sent to the Children of Israel, who are God's peculiar People, and are so named of him. See Lev. xxvi. 12. Micah iv. 5.

LI. Where it is to be observed, that this Being is spoken of, *as coming out of the Mouth* of the Most High, *made and created*; which must be understood in the same Sense with those Words of *Moses*, when he describes the Creation of *Light*: *And God said, Let there be Light, and there was Light*, Gen. i. 3. It is likewise to be observed, that this Guardian Angel of *Israel*, whose *Throne* was in *the cloudy Pillar*, &c. is here declared to have been a *created* Being, in Terms as strong and plain as it is in the Power of Language to express. It may also further be remarked, that although he is positively said to have been *made and created*, yet, because he was spoken into Existence before the Sun and the Moon, those Measures of Duration, which were given Mankind, [8] *for Signs and for Seasons, and*

[8] Gen. i. 14.

52 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

for Days and for Years; because he was *in the Beginning, before the World*, he styles himself *eternal*. See Sect. xxxiii.

LII. And in the same Kind of Style it is that *Solomon*, speaking of this same Being under the Denomination of *Wisdom*, represents it as a separate intelligent Agent, personally subsisting with God *from Everlasting*, because it was *brought forth* before the Creation of this World. For thus, speaking in the Person, and under the Character of *Wisdom*, he saith [9], *Jehovah* [1] *possessed me in the Beginning of his Ways, before his Works of old. I was set up from Everlasting, from the Beginning, or ever the Earth was. When there were no Depths, I was BROUGHT FORTH; when there were no Fountains abounding with Water. Before the Mountains were settled; before the Hills was I BROUGHT FORTH; while as yet he had not made the Earth, nor the Fields, nor the highest Parts of the Dust of the World. When he prepared the Heavens, I was there: When he set a Compass upon the Face of the Deep: When he gave to the Sea his Decree, that the Wa-*

[9] Prov. viii. 22. [1] In the Septuagint it is, *The Lord created me.*

ter should not pass his Commandment : When he appointed the Foundations of the Earth ; then I was by him as one brought up with him : And I was always his Delight, rejoicing always before him.

LIII. But *Philo Judæus* further observes, that this Archangel with many Names, whose Portion was *Israel*, was also called by *the Name of God*. Now let us see what Foundation there is for this in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. The Name of God, which the *Jews* never pronounced, but called it the ineffable Name, was *Jehovah* ; so that, whenever in reading the Bible, they met with this Word, instead thereof, they always said *Adonai* or *Elohim* ; and the Authors of the Septuagint Translation of the Bible, who were *Jews*, when they rendered it into *Greek*, always translated it by the Word *Κύριος*, which we in *English* render *the Lord*. Which is the Reason also why *Philo* does not mention that Name of God by which this Archangel was denominated, but says only, in general, that he was called by *the Name of God*. Now the Instances in the Old Testament, where an Angel, and in particular, that

54 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

Angel which acted as a Guardian Angel to the Seed of *Abraham*, and presided over the Children of *Israel*, is called *Jehovah*, are very numerous.

LIV. Thus, when *Hagar* fled from the Face of her Mistress, it is said, that *an Angel of Jehovah found her in the Wilderness, and the Angel of Jehovah said unto her, Return to thy Mistress.* Now, though *Moses* in this Place calls the Person who spake to *Hagar* an Angel of *Jehovah*, yet *Moses* afterwards mentions this same Person under the direct Name of *Jehovah*: For, says he, [2] *Hagar called the Name of JEHOVAH that spake to her, Thou God seest me.*

LV. Thus also it is said of *Abraham*, that [3] *JEHOVAH appeared unto him in the Plains of Mamre; and he sat at the Tent-Door in the Heat of the Day; and he lift up his Eyes and looked, and lo, three Men stood by him.* Now that two of the Persons which are here called Men, because they appeared as such, had each of them the Appellation of *Jehovah* given them, will ap-

[2] Gen. xvi. 7—13.

[3] Gen. xviii. 1, &c.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 55

pear from the Context : For when one of these Men enquired for *Sarah*, and said, *Lo ! Sarah thy Wife shall have a Son* ; upon which *Sarah* laughed within herself ; then it is positively said, that *JEHOVAH* said unto Abraham, *Why did Sarah laugh ? Is any thing too hard for Jehovah ?* And yet it is said, after all this, that *the Men rose up from thence, and looked towards Sodom ; and Abraham went with them to bring them on the Way : And JEHOVAH said, Shall I hide from Abraham that Thing which I do ?* And when *two of the Men* had turned their Faces from thence, and went towards *Sodom* ; it is said, Abraham stood yet before Jehovah. And when Abraham was pleading in Favour of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, he said, among other Things, to this *Jehovah* with whom he was conversing, *Shall not the Judge of all the Earth do right ?* And when the Discourse was ended, *Moses* says, that *JEHOVAH went his Way, as soon as he had left communing with Abraham, and Abraham returned to his Place.* Whence it is manifest beyond all Doubt, that one of these three Men who was left alone in Conversation with Abraham, is called *Jehovah, and the Judge of all the Earth.*

LVI. And when the two Men, which had left *Abraham* and *Jehovah* conversing together, came to *Sodom*, it is said, [4] *And there came two ANGELS to Sodom at Even. And when the Morning arose, then the ANGELS hastened Lot. And he said,* that is, one of the Angels said, *Escape for thy Life; for I cannot do any thing till thou be come thither. And the Sun was risen upon the Earth, when Lot entered into Zoar. Then JEHOVAH rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah Brimstone and Fire from JEHOVAH out of Heaven.* Whence it is plain, that one of these two Angels is here also dignified with the Appellation of *Jehovah*, and yet is represented as acting under the Influence of another *Jehovah* in Heaven. So that it is manifest, here are two distinct Persons, or Angels, which appeared upon Earth, to each of which is given the Appellation of *Jehovah*.

LVII. Again, when *Jacob* lived with his Father *Laban*, and was giving an Account to his Wives of their Father's Conduct and

[4] Gen. xix. 1, &c.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 57

Behaviour towards him, he says, [5] *And the Angel of God spake to me in a Dream, saying, Jacob; and I said, Here am I; and he said, I am the God of Bethel, where thou anointedst the Pillar, and vowed a Vow unto me.* Now the Vow which Jacob made at Bethel was this: [6] *If God be with me, and will keep me in this Way, that I go, and will give me Bread to eat, and Raiment to put on; so that I come again to my Father's House in Peace: Then shall JEHOVAH be my God.* Whence it is plain, that an Angel of God, speaking to Jacob, calls himself [7] *Jehovah the God of Bethel.*

LVIII. Thus also we find it said, that [8] *the ANGEL OF JEHOVAH appeared unto Moses, in a Flame of Fire out of the Bush. And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great Sight, why the Bush is not burnt. And when JEHOVAH saw that he had turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the Midst of the Bush. Moreover he said, I am the God of thy Fathers, the*

[5] Gen. xxiv 47. xxxi. 11, 13. [6] Gen. xxviii. 20, 21.

[7] See also Gen. xxxii. 24, &c. and compare it with Hosea xii. 4, 5. [8] Exod. iii. 2, 6. Acts vii. 30, 35.

58 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his Face; for he was afraid to look upon God. Where it is manifest, that an Angel is called by Moses, Jehovah; and that the Angel calls himself the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,

LIX. Thus also, when the Children of Israel were marching towards the Red-Sea, it is said, that [9] *the ANGEL of God, which went before the Camp of Israel, removed and went behind them, and the Pillar of the Cloud went from before their Face, and stood behind them.* And yet, in another Place, it is said, that [1] *JEHOVAH went before them by Day in a Pillar of a Cloud, to lead them the Way; and by Night in a Pillar of Fire, to give them Light.*

LX. It is also said, when Moses went up to Mount Sinai, That [2] *JEHOVAH called unto him out of the Mountain.* And again, That *Moses came and called for the Elders of the People, and laid before their Faces all these Words which JEHOVAH commanded him:*

[9] *Exod. xiv. 19.* [1] *Exod. xiii. 21.* [2] *Exod. xix. 3, &c.*

And

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 59

And that Moses *returned all the Words of the People of Israel unto* JEHOVAH: That JEHOVAH *said again unto Moses, Go unto the People, and sanctify them To-day and To-morrow, and be ready against the third Day: For the third Day JEHOVAH will come down, in the Sight of all the People, upon Mount Sinai. And the third Day Mount Sinai was altogether on a Smoke, because JEHOVAH descended upon it in Fire. ---And JEHOVAH came down upon Mount Sinai.---And JEHOVAH called up Moses unto the Top of the Mount. And God spake all these Words, saying, I am JEHOVAH thy God, which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, &c.* And yet St. Stephen, who was a Jew, affirms, that [3] *the Law was given by the Disposition of ANGELS: And that it was an ANGEL that spake to Moses from Mount Sinai, and with our Fathers, who received the lively Oracles to give unto us.* And St. Paul says, [4] *that the Law was ordained of ANGELS.* And, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, he calls it [5] *the Word spoken of ANGELS.*

[3] Acts vii. 33, 38. [4] Gal. iii. 9. [5] Heb. ii. 2.

- LXI. It is likewise to be observed, that when [6] *Moses* and *Aaron*, and *Nadab* and *Abihu*, and seventy of the Elders of *Israel*, went up into the Mount, by the Command of God, it is said, *They saw the God of Israel*; ---also *they saw God*, and *did eat and drink*: That is, They saw the God of *Israel*, and did live to eat and drink. Whereas, when *Moses* afterwards applied to God, and begged it of him, as a Favour, that he might see his Glory, or Face, that he might know him; [7] *JEHOVAH* said unto him, *Thou canst not see my Face; for there shall no Man see me, and live*. But, says he to *Moses*, *I will make all my Goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the Name of JEHOVAH before thee: And it shall come to pass, while my Glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a Cleft of the Rock, and will cover thee with my Hand while I pass by: And I will take away mine Hand, and thou shalt see what* [8]

[6] *Exod. xxiv. 10, &c.* [7] *Exod. xxxiii. 20, &c.*

[8] The Original, which, in our Translation, we render *Back-Parts*, properly signifies any Thing or Person that is behind or followeth another. In which Sense it is used *Gen. xviii. 10.* when *Moses* saith, *And Sarah heard it in the*

follows

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 61

follows me; but my Face shall not be seen. And accordingly, when *Moses* returned to the Mount, it is said, that *JEHOVAH* descended in the Cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the Name of *JEHOVAH*. And *JEHOVAH* passed by before him, and proclaimed *JEHOVAH*, *JEHOVAH* God, merciful and gracious, &c. And *Moses* made haste, and bowed his Head and worshiped.

LXII. Whence it is manifest, that this *Jehovah*, whom *Moses* made haste to worship, could not be that *Jehovah*, whose Face could not be seen, whom no Man could see and live; but the *Jehovah* who followed the invisible *Jehovah*, and was probably the same Person with that God of *Israel*, who was seen by *Moses* and *Aaron*, and *Nadab* and *Abihu*, and the seventy Elders of *Israel*: And who is called by God in another Place, *the Similitude*, or Image, of *Jehovah*. For, says *Jehovah* unto the

Tent-door, which was BEHIND him So also, *Joshua* vi. 13. And the Rereward followed AFTER the Ark. So also 2 Sam. x. 9. When *Joab* saw that the Front of the Battle was against him before and BEHIND. See also 2 Chron. xiii. 14, &c. &c.

People

People of *Israel*, with my *Servant Moses* will I speak Mouth to Mouth; and [9] the Similitude of *Jehovah* shall be behold.

LXIII. Now this *Jehovah*, or this Similitude, Image, or Representative of *Jehovah*, which *Moses* beheld, is manifestly the same Person with that Guardian Angel of *Israel*, who had so often appeared already, and spoken to *Abraham*, *Jacob*, and *Moses*, in the Name and Person of *Jehovah*; because it was on this very Account that *Moses* desired of God to shew him his Glory, that he might know the Person who was to conduct the *Israelites* into the promised Land. For thus it is, that *Moses* introduceth his Request: [1] *And Moses said unto JEHOVAH, See thou sayest unto me, bring up this People: And thou hast not let me know whom thou wilt send with me.---Now therefore I pray thee, if I have found Grace in thy Sight, shew me now [2] THY WAY;*

[9] Numb. xii. 7, 8. [1] Exod. xxxiii. 12, &c.

[2] The original Word יְהוָה is used in a great Variety of Senses in the Old Testament; the Septuagint Version renders it in this Place σεαυτον, *thyself*. And in the same Sense it probably is, that *David*, praying to *Jehovah*, says, *God be merciful unto us, and bless us; and cause thy Face to shine*

that

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 63

that I may know thee : And consider that this Nation is thy People. And JEHOVAH said, I will do this Thing that thou hast spoken, &c. And he said, Thou canst not see my Face ; for there shall no Man see my Face and live. But it shall come to pass, while my Glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a Clift of the Rock ; and will cover thee with mine Hand, while I pass by ; and I will take away mine Hand, and thou shalt see what followeth me : But my Face shall not be seen, &c.

LXIV. So that this Being which followed *Jehovah*, this *Way*, this *Glory* of *Jehovah*, whom the invisible *Jehovah* proclaimed to be *Jehovah* as well as himself, is manifestly that Angel, who was appointed by God to conduct the *Israelites* into the promised Land. And therefore God saith to *Moses*, in another Place, [3] *Behold I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the Way,*

upon us : That THY WAY (or Thou) may be known upon Earth, thy saving Health among all Nations, Psal. lxxvii. 2. And in Psal. lxxviii. 13. he says, THY WAY, O God, (or Thou) is in the Sanctuary. And hence probably it is, that the Prophet Amos calls the God or Idol of Beersheba, the Way of Beersheba, Am. viii. 14.

[3] *Exod. xxiii. 20, 21.*

and

64 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

and to bring thee into the Place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his Voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your Transgressions; FOR MY NAME IS IN HIM. That is, Behold, I send an Angel before thee acting in my Stead, and by my Authority; beware of him, and obey his Voice, provoke him not, for *I have proclaimed him Jehovah*; and, as he acts by my Authority, and my Power is delegated unto him, as my *Similitude*, Image, or Representative, he will not pardon your Transgressions, for my Name of *Jehovah* is in him.

LXV. And hence it comes to pass, that this Second *Jehovah* is in a particular Manner distinguished by the Appellation of the *God of Israel*, the *Jehovah of Zion*, and the *Jehovah of the Jews*. For thus the Prophet *Hosea*, speaking by Authority from God, the great *Jehovah*, saith, [4] *But I will have Mercy on the House of Judah*, and will save them by **JEHOVAH THEIR GOD**. And *Zechariah* the Prophet, speaking of the same People,

[4] Hof. i. 7.

saith,

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 65

saith, [5] *I will strengthen them in JEHOVAH, and they shall walk up and down in HIS NAME, saith Jehovah.* Not in my Name, but in his Name, saith the invifible *Jehovah*; that is, in the Name of *the God of Israel*, whom they had feen. And, in another Place, the fame Prophet saith, [6] *Sing and rejoice, O Daughters of Zion; for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the Midst of thee, saith JEHOVAH: And many Nations shall be joined to JEHOVAH in that Day, and shall be my People: And I will dwell in the Midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the JEHOVAH OF HOSTS hath sent me unto thee.* Where the *Jehovah of Zion* is plainly distinguished from the *Jehovah of Hosts*, and acknowledgeth himself to be sent by him.

LXVI. The only Difficulty in this Case is this, that the *Jehovah of Zion*, though in this one Place he acknowledgeth himself to be sent by the *Jehovah of Hosts*, yet in other Places this *Jehovah of Zion*, or the Angel which appeared unto *Abraham* and *Jacob*, and *Moses*, does not always de-

[5] Zech. x. 12.

[6] Zech. ii. 10, 11.

66 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

clare that he is deputed, and speaks by the delegated Authority of the *Jehovah* of Hosts; which is the general Meaning of the Phrase of speaking *in the Name* of any one; but actually and literally speaks in his own Name, and calls himself *Jehovah*, and saith, *I am the God of Abraham*; and *I am the God of Bethel*; and *I brought thee out of the Land of Egypt*, &c. and positively prohibits *Moses* and the Children of *Israel* from worshiping any other God but himself: *Thou*, says he, *shalt have none other Gods before me*. Thereby seeming to forbid even the Worship of the Supreme *Jehovah*, the *Jehovah of Hosts*.

LXVII. In Answer to which it is to be observed, that the *Hebrews* were far from being explicit and accurate in their Style, but left great Room for the [7] Imagination of the Reader to supply, and fill up the Deficiencies; and that it was very customary for one Person to speak in the Name

[7] Any one that does but open the *English* Bible, and observe the Number of Words that are inserted in *Italick* Characters, none of which are in the Original, will immediately perceive the Truth of this Assertion.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 67

and Character of another Person, without making the least Mention of the other Person, in whose Name the Words were spoken. Thus it is allowed by the universal Consent of all Antiquity, as well *Jews* as *Christians*, that, in the second Psalm, *David* is there speaking of the *Messiah*, and yet the whole Psalm is delivered in the Person and Character of *David* himself. *Why*, says he, *do the Heathen rage, and the People imagine a vain Thing? The Kings of the Earth set themselves, and the Rulers take Counsel together against JEHOVAH, and against his Anointed. He that sitteth in Heaven shall laugh; JEHOVAH shall have them in Derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his Wrath, and vex them in his sore Displeasure. Yet have I set my King upon my holy Hill of Sion. I will declare the Decree JEHOVAH hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance, and the uttermost Parts of the Earth for thy Possession.*

LXVIII. Now it is plain, that the Decree here spoken of, though it was deliver-

68 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

ed unto *David*, yet the Purport thereof was not promised to *David*, but to some one of the Seed of *David*, 2 *Sam.* vii. 12, 14, 16, of whom God said, *I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son.* And yet *David* saith, when speaking of this Decree, *I will declare the Decree* JEHOVAH *hath said unto ME, THOU art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee.* And what is further remarkable is, that it was not *Jehovah*, but *Nathan* the Prophet, who spake to *David* by Authority from God.

LXIX. And indeed nothing is more common than for Prophets and Angels to speak authoritatively in their own Name, without introducing their Speech with an explanatory Preface, mentioning the Person in whose Name they speak. Thus the Prophet *Isaiah* saith, [8] *The Word that Isaiah the Son of Amos saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem ---* [9] *For behold the Lord, the JEHOVAH OF HOSTS doth take away from Jerusalem and from Judah the Stay and the Staff, &c.---* And then some Verses after-

[8] *Isai.* ii. 1. [9] *Isai.* iii. 1—4.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 69

wards, he saith, *And I will give Children to be their Princes, and Babes shall rule over them, &c.* Where it is manifest, that the Prophet speaks in this last Place in the first Person, in his own Name, without inserting the Words, *and JEHOVAH said unto me*, which seem necessary to have been inserted, in order to make his Words intelligible, if he intended they should be understood of *Jehovah*, and not of himself; but that he knew very well the *Jews* would, of themselves, supply the Deficiency.

LXX. In like Manner, in the Revelation of St. *John*, though the Apostle declares, that it was delivered to him by an Angel, and calls it [1] *The Revelation of JESUS CHRIST, which GOD gave unto him, to shew unto his Servants Things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his ANGEL unto his Servant John.*: Yet through the whole Book this Angel speaks indifferently in the first Person, either when he speaks in the Name of God the Father, or in the Name of *Jesus Christ*, or in his own Name. Thus, *Rev.*

[1] *Rev. i. 1.*

70 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

i. 10. St. *John* says, *I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-Day, and heard behind me a great Voice, as of a Trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, &c.* Now this Voice was undoubtedly the Voice of the Angel, who was sent to testify unto him; and yet he speaks in the first Person, saying, *I am Alpha and Omega*: And Verse 13. when he turned to see the Voice that spake with him, he says, [2] *And when I saw him, I fell at his Feet as dead: And he laid his Right-hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not: I am the First and the Last; I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore.* Where it is manifest that this Angel speaks at once both in the Name of God the Father, and of God the Son; because he calls himself *Alpha and Omega*; and yet declares he was once *dead*. And yet, Chapter iii. 14. this same Angel speaks only in the Name of *Jesus Christ*, saying, *These Things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness,*
 THE BEGINNING OF THE CREATION
 OF GOD: Which is the Character given by St. *Paul* of *Jesus Christ*, who styles

[2] Rev. i. 17.

him

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 71

him [3] *the First-born of the whole Creation.*

LXXI. However, towards the Close of the whole Revelation, St. John says, [4] *I John saw these Things and heard them, and when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the Feet of the Angel which shewed me these Things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not; for I am thy Fellow-Servant, and of thy Brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep the Sayings of this Book: Worship God. And he saith unto me, Seal not the Sayings of the Prophecy of this Book; for the Time is at Hand.---And behold I come quickly; and my Reward is with me, to give to every Man according as his Works shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End; the First and the Last.---I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify unto you these Things in the Churches. I am the Root and the Offspring of David, and the bright and the Morning-Star.*

[3] Πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. i.e. The First-born of the whole Creation; and not, as we translate it, *the First-born of every Creature*, Col. i. 15. [4] Rev. xxii. 8, &c.

LXXII. Where it is manifest, that this *Angel*, who had refused Worship and Adoration, and had declared himself to be a created Being, the Fellow-Servant of *John*, and of his Brethren the Prophets; yet because he was sent by *Jesus* to testify that Revelation, [5] which was given unto *Jesus* by *God*, he therefore speaks indifferently in the first Person, *I*, either when he speaks in his own Person, in the Person of *Jesus*, or in the Person of *God* the Father. So that it should seem no extraordinary Thing to find that exalted *Angel* whom *God* had proclaimed *Jehovah*, speaking also in the first Person, and saying, *I am that am*, or, *I am the God of Abraham*, or the *God of Bethel*, &c.

LXXIII. This however is manifest from The whole taken together, that the *Jews* had great Foundation in the Scriptures of the Old Testament for their Opinion of a *Δευτερος Θεός*, a Second or Secondary God, that is, one who acted by a deputed Power from the Supreme God; which *Philo* calls

[5] Rev. i. 1.

the Archangel with many Names : For it appears he was therein called, *The great Prince which standeth for the Children of Israel* ; *The Word of God* ; *The Wisdom of God* ; *The Similitude, or Image, of God* ; and *Jehovah*, or the *Name of God*.

LXXIV. Now then let us see what Foundation there is in the Scriptures of the Old Testament for the Opinion of a third Person, whom the *Jews ἀποθεύζουσιν*, paid divine Honours to. And here it may be observed, that it hath been already shewed, that two of the Angels, which appeared to *Abraham* in the Similitude of Men, were each called by the Name of *Jehovah* [6] : For as the one which remained conversing with *Abraham*, while the other two went towards *Sodom*, was called *Jehovah*, so also is one of the two Angels which went to destroy *Sodom*, called *Jehovah* also : For, says *Moses*, *JEHOVAH rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah Brimstone and Fire from JEHOVAH out of Heaven*.

[6] See Sect. LVI.

LXXV. It is likewise to be observed, that in the Prophecy of [7] *Zechariah*, that Prophet, in declaring a Vision which he had seen of a Candlestick, with two Olive-Trees by it, says, that an *Angel* talked with him, and *Zechariah* said unto him, *What be these two Olive-Trees upon the Right Side of the Candlestick and upon the Left Side thereof? And I answered again and said unto him, What be these two Olive-Branches, which through the golden Pipes empty the golden Oil out of themselves? And he answered me, and said, These are the TWO ANOINTED ONES, THAT STAND by the Lord of the whole Earth.*

LXXVI. Now it is manifest, that That Angel, whose *Portion* is *Israel*, is by the Prophet *Isaiah* called the Angel of God's Presence. For, says that Prophet, [8] *I will mention the loving Kindness of JEHOVAH, and his great Goodness towards the House of Israel. ----- In all their Afflictions he was afflicted, and the ANGEL OF HIS PRESENCE saved them.* And as this An-

[7] *Zech. iv. 1, &c.* [8] *Isai. lxiii. 7, 9.*

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 75

gel, or *great Prince*, which standeth for the *Children of Israel*, is by that Prophet *Daniel* distinguished by the Name of *Michael*; so it may be further proper to take Notice, that there is another Angel named by a particular Name in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, who is called [9] *Gabriel*; which *Gabriel*, according to St. [1] *Luke*, called himself also *the Angel that standeth in the Presence of God*. So that here are plainly two Angels, one of which, for Distinction-sake, is called *Michael*, and the other *Gabriel*, which are described as standing in the Presence of God, or, as *Zechariah* expresseth it, *which stand by the Lord of the whole Earth*. As a Type of which, according to [2] *Philo Judæus*, it was, that, at the Building of the Tabernacle, God directed only two *Cherubim* to be placed over the *Mercy-Seat* in the *Holy of Holies*.

LXXVII. And as it appears, that the Archangel *Michael* is that Person who is called the *Second Essence* by the *Jews*, so, upon Inquiry, we shall find that the Angel *Ga-*

[9] As *Michael* signifies the *Similitude of God*; so *Gabriel* signifies, the *Strength*, or *Power of God*. [1] *Luke* i. 19.

[2] *Phil. Vit. Mosi*, lib. iii. p. 669. Edit. Fanc. 1691.

76 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

bric has a very good Title towards being considered as that *Third Essence*, or Being, to which the *Jews* paid divine Honours. For the Opinion of the *Jews*, with regard to this Third Being, was, [3] that “ after
 “ the Second Essence comes the *Holy Spirit*;
 “ which they place in this Royal Dignity,
 “ and Degree of Principality, because it is
 “ the Will of the great Architect to ap-
 “ point him to the Principality of those in-
 “ ferior Beings, who may want his Assist-
 “ ance. Who therefore, obtaining the third
 “ Place, confers on those, who are inferior
 “ to him, those excellent Virtues which he
 “ himself received from another, to wit,
 “ from the divine *Logos*, his Better and Su-
 “ perior, whom we before said was the Se-
 “ cond to the supreme, unbegotten, and al-
 “ mighty God.” So says *Eusebius*, “ All
 “ the *Hebrew* Divines, after that God,
 “ who is over all, and after this first-born
 “ Wisdom, pay divine Worship to the third
 “ and holy Power, which they call the
 “ Holy Spirit, by which they themselves
 “ are illuminated when they are divinely
 “ inspired.”

[3] *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* lib. vii. cap. 15.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 77

LXXVIII. Now it is manifest, that the Angel *Gabriel* was employed in the Administration of this Office, that is, in the illuminating of those who were divinely inspired; which the Prophet *Zechariah* metaphorically expresseth, by *emptying through golden Pipes, the golden Oil out of themselves*. Since it was undoubtedly for this Purpose that *Gabriel* was sent to the Prophet [4] *Daniel*, to make him understand the Vision: And to give him Skill and Understanding. And therefore, it is probable, that this Angel *Gabriel* was that *holy Spirit* who was employed by God in illuminating the rest of the Prophets of Old, and who is so often mentioned in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, under the Name of *the holy Spirit*, the *Spirit of God*, or the *Spirit of Jehovah*. For thus the Prophet [5] *Nehemiah* positively saith, that *Jehovah* testified against the Wicked by his Spirit in his Prophets. And the Prophet [6] *Zechariah* saith, *They made their Hearts as an Adamant Stone, lest they should hear the Law, and the Words which the JEHOVAH OF HOSTS HATH SENT BY HIS SPIRIT in the former Prophets*.

[4] Dan. viii. 16. ix. 21, 22. [5] Neh. ix. 63.

[6] Zech. vii. 12.

LXXIX. Which Words plainly prove this Spirit to have been an intelligent Agent, separate and distinct from God, because he was *sent* by him For though Men may be said to be inspired, or actuated, by the Spirit of God, when God is pleased to inspire or influence them by virtue of his own almighty Power, without deputing any other Spirit to do it: Yet it is manifest that God cannot *send* himself; because those Terms imply a Contradiction. And therefore the Prophet *Isaiab* is said to have been *sent* both by God and his Spirit. For, says he, [7] *And now Jehovah God, and his Spirit hath sent me.* And in the Books of [8] *Judges* and *Samuel*, it is not said, that it was *Jehovah*, but the *Spirit of Jehovah*, which *came upon* Othoniel, and Gideon, and Jephtha, and Sampson, and Saul, and David, to assist them in the Government of *Israel*, and the Execution of their Office. And the holy [9] *David*, in the penitential Psalm, which he composed on his Transgression with *Bathsheba*,

[7] *Isai.* xlviii. 16. [8] See *Judg.* iii. 10. vi. 34. xi 29. xiii. 25. 1 *Sam.* x. 6. xvi, 13. [9] *Psal.* li. 11, 12, 13.

begs of Almighty God, *not to take his HOLY SPIRIT from him; but, says he, restore me unto the Joy of thy Salvation, and uphold me with thy FREE SPIRIT.*

LXXX. And therefore this holy Spirit is sometimes said to enter into Men when it inspired them. For thus the Prophet *Ezekiel* declares, that the Spirit [1] *entered into him when it spake unto him.* And the Prophet *Isaiah*, speaking of *Moses*, saith, that [2] *God put his holy Spirit within him.* Which likewise shews this Spirit to have been a separate intelligent Agent, distinct from God himself, because it is said, that it was God who PUT *this holy Spirit within him.*

LXXXI. And as it pleased God, that this *holy Spirit* should sometimes manifest its Abode in particular People, by some outward and visible Token, for the Sake of the By-Standers, that they might be obedient unto those Persons upon whom it abode; therefore it is, in the Language of the holy Scriptures, sometimes said to *rest upon* those

[1] Ezek. ii. 2. iii. 24. [2] Isai. vi. 3.

on whom it was conferred. Thus, when God ordered *Moses* to appoint Seventy Elders, who should assist him in the Distribution of Justice, it is said, that [3] *Jehovah came down in a Cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the Spirit that was UPON HIM, and gave it to the Seventy Elders; and it came to pass, that when THE SPIRIT RESTED UPON THEM, they prophesied and did not cease.*

LXXXII. Now it is observed of *Moses*, that, when he came the last Time down from Mount *Sinai*, [4] *the Skin of his Face shone*, so that the People were afraid to come nigh him. It is therefore probable, that this Manifestation of the *Spirit* which was conferred on *Moses*, and from him divided among the Seventy Elders, was a kind of lucid shining Appearance which rested upon them as an outward and visible Token of the inward Assistance and Illumination of the *Holy Spirit*. And therefore God also commanded *Moses*, when he appointed *Joshua* for his Successor, to [5] *take*

[3] Numb. xi. 16, 25. [4] Exod. xxxiv. 29.

[5] Numb. xxvii. 20.

Joshua *the Son of Nun*, and, says he, *thou shalt lay some of thine Honour UPON HIM, that all the Congregation of the Children of Israel may be obedient*: In like Manner, when *Elisha* was appointed Successor to *Elijah*, it is said, *the Spirit of Elijah, or the Spirit which was on Elijah, doth REST ON Elisha. And they came to meet him, and bowed themselves before him.*

LXXXIII. But when this *Holy Spirit* was pleased to make its Appearance, either in the Figure and Form of an Angel or Man, the *Jews* then Ἀποθεύζουσιν, paid divine Honours to it: As *Daniel* did to the Angel [6] *Gabriel*, when it appeared unto him in the Form of a Man; for, saith he, [7] *I was afraid, and fell upon my Face*: As *Ezekiel* also did to the [8] *Holy Spirit*, when it appeared unto him in [9] *the Likeness of the Glory of Jehovah*; for, says he, *When* [1] *I saw it, I fell upon my Face*. Which was the usual Method of Prostration both with [2]

[6] Dan. viii. 16. ix. 21. [7] Dan. viii. 17. [8] Ezek. ii. 2. iii. 24. [9] Ezek. i. 28. [1] Ezek. i. 28. iii. 3. xliii. 3, 4. xlv. 4. [2] Ezek. ix. 8. xi. 13.

82 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

him, and all the ancient [3] Prophets and Patriarchs, whenever they had any earnest Request to make to Almighty God; or when they apprehended that an Angel sent from God was speaking to them.

LXXXIV. And indeed it seems but reasonable, that, beside the Respect which is due to this *Holy Spirit* on account of the Excellency of its own Nature, there should be a further Degree of Reverence and Regard paid unto him, in proportion to the Degree of Power or Authority over us, which is committed unto him from God: Since it is but just, that whatever Degree of Superiority the Almighty is pleased to give to any one Being over others, there should be a suitable Degree of Submission and Obedience paid to that Being, in proportion to the Extent of Authority delegated from God.

LXXXV. Not that Angels, as Angels, have any Right to divine Worship or Adoration upon their own Account; and there-

[3] Gen. xvii. 3. Numb. xvi. 22. xxii. 31. Josh. v. 14. See also Matt. xxvi. 39. Mark xiv. 35. Though he first kneeled down, Luke xxii. 41.

fore all [4] *voluntary Humility and Worshiping of Angels*, even the highest, out of our own Head, or without a Commission from God for so doing, would be Idolatry: which was the Reason why that Angel who was sent from God to shew the Revelation to St. *John*, reprimanding the Apostle, when he [5] *fell down to WORSHIP before the Feet of the Angel which shewed him these Things*, saying, *See thou do it not. --- Worship God*. Because St. *John* seems to have paid this *Worship* to the Angel on his own Account, without any Regard to the Authority by which he was sent; which would have been Idolatry. But when Angels are commission'd from God, with any Degree of Power over us, and are sent in his Name; then it cannot be Idolatry, to pay them such a Degree of Adoration, as is proportionate to the Authority with which they are invested: Because such Adoration or Worship, not being paid them on their own Account, but on account of the Authority which hath

[4] Col. ii. 18. — Whether our Translation is strictly just, I will not say; but sure I am, that it corresponds to the Meaning of the Apostle. However *Grotius* may be consulted by any one who wants further Satisfaction.

[5] Rev. xxii. 8.

84 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

been delegated unto them, terminates in the one only and supreme God. See Sect. CXIII, CXIV.

LXXXVI. Which Method of Reasoning may be pursued from the highest Degree of Worship, payable to the most perfect Being next to God, acting with the highest Authority which God is pleased to communicate or delegate, down to the lowest Degree of Deference or Respect, which, Reason instructs us, is proper to pay to some of our own Fellow-Creatures for the Preservation of a due Subordination in Society: Since in this Sense it is, that [6] *not only the Powers which be, are ordained of God*; but also that those Prophets and Judges of *Israel* [7] *to whom the Word of God came, are called Gods*; because they spoke by his Authority, and acted in his Stead.

LXXXVII. Which Doctrine of the *Jews* with regard to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, seems therefore not only to be supported by the Doc-

[6] Rom. xiii. 1. [7] See Exod. xxii. 18. Ps. lxxxii. 1, 2, 6. John x. 34, 35.

trine of the Old Testament, but also reconcilable to Reason ; since, if we do but reflect on the immense Distance there is between the imperfect State of human Beings, and the infinite Perfection of Almighty God, we cannot but think that God should chuse to govern this Universe by a gradual Subordination of Beings, one superior to another; rather than to be the sole Director or Governor of every the most minute Affair : Not that such a Government would be troublesome to God, or that he would be unable to perform it, or that God can possibly divest himself of the supreme Authority, universal Inspection, and general Superintendency even of the minutest Transaction in the whole Creation : But because it seems more consistent with the divine Goodness and Wisdom, to employ the various Works of his Hands, in the Exercise of those Powers and Faculties with which he hath endowed them; rather than personally and immediately to interpose in the Conduct of those Transactions, for which he hath created Numbers of Beings furnished with Abilities sufficient to perform them.

LXXXVIII. It is likewise reasonable to believe that the same Method of Government, which God hath ordained in this sublunary Globe, is carried on by a Kind of *Analogy* through the whole Creation. And that as the great Creator hath been pleased to constitute this World in such a Manner, as to require the Authority of some Persons presiding over others, in Families, in Towns, in Cities, in Provinces, in Kingdoms, in Empires ; so probably in the great Expanse of Spirits, there are Degrees of Superiority analogous to these sublunary Dispositions ; which we have no better Method of expressing, than by calling them in Allusion to the Things which we do know [8] *Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers.*

LXXXIX. And as this Doctrine is reconcilable with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, the Sentiments of the *Jewish* Divines, and with Reason ; so is it also with the Scriptures of the New Testament. For, says St. Paul, [9] *Though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or Earth,*

[8] Col. i. 16.

[9] 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 87

(for there be Gods many, and Lords many) yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all Things, and we by him. That is, there is but one supreme God, in comparison of whom there is [1] none other but he; and with regard to whom Jesus the Christ is only to be called Lord and not God: The Father having given him a Name that is above every other Name, that every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is LORD, to the Glory of God the Father. Phil. ii. 9, 11.

XC. Which God the Father, as he is described by Moses, under the Character of that God, [2] whose Face cannot be seen; for no Man can see him and live; so also St. Paul characterises him as that God, who is [3] the blessed and ONLY Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, WHO ONLY hath Immortality, dwelling in the Light which no Man can approach unto, WHOM NO MAN HATH OR CAN SEE. And St. John says, [4] No Man hath seen

[1] Mark xii. 32. [2] Exod. xxxiii. 20, 23. [3] 1 Tim. xi. 15, 16. [4] John i. 18. vi. 46. 1 John iv. 12.

88 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

God at any Time. Which one, only, invisible God cannot therefore possibly be the same with that God who [5] *was manifested in the Flesh.*

XCI. Whence it appears, that here is a Distinction made by the Apostles between the Divinity of God the Father and of God the Son : And that although the Term of *God*, as when we say, There are Gods many, may be attributed to the Son, yet that, strictly speaking, as when we say, There is but one God, this Appellation is only to be attributed to God the Father ; and accordingly the *Nicene Creed*, as all the ancient Creeds did, begins with saying, *I believe in one God the Father Almighty, &c.* And the Reason assigned for this Distinction by *St. Paul* is, because God the Father is alone to be considered as *the* [6] *first Cause* ; for, says he, *there is one God the Father, OF WHOM ARE ALL THINGS* : And therefore God the Father is by the Son himself styled [7] *the only true God*. For, says he, when speaking of the Father, *This is eternal Life, that*

[5] 1 Tim. iii. 16.

[6] See Sect. iji.

[7] John xvii. 3.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 89

they may know THEE THE ONLY TRUE GOD, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

XCII. As therefore the first Self-existent Cause of whom are all Things, can alone be properly called God, when the Title of God is given in the Scriptures to any other Being but the Father, we are to understand this, only as expressive of some God-like Power, which hath been given or communicated to that Being by God the Father. And accordingly *Jehovah* said unto *Moses*, when he sent him to *Pharaoh*, and communicated to him the Power of working Miracles, [8] *Thou shalt be to him instead of God*: Which he thus expresseth in another Place, [9] *See I have made thee a God to Pharaoh*. When all Power therefore in Heaven and Earth was given to the Son, he was made a God to those Beings over whom that Power was given, that is, over those Beings which inhabit this Heaven and this Earth, and over those only, since it is manifest at the same Time, that he must be excepted who did give this Power unto

[8] Exod. iv. 16.

[9] Exod. xvii. 1.

him ;

90 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

him; and therefore St. *Paul* positively declares, when speaking of the Son, that [1] *when it is said, All Things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all Things under him: and when all things shall be subdued unto him, then, says he, shall the Son also, that is, even in his highest State of exalted Glory, be subject unto him that did put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*

XCIII. And as that secondary Effence among the *Jews* whose Portion was *Israel*, was by them called *the Word* and *the Wisdom* of God: So it is undoubted that these Appellations were from thence transferred, by the Apostles of *Christ* who were born and bred *Jews*, into the Christian Religion, and applied by them to *Jesus* the *Christ*, who is in the Scriptures of the New Testament called [2] *the Word* and *the Wisdom* of God.

XCIV. And as that secondary Effence was by the *Jews* called *the Image of God*, so is the Lord *Jesus Christ* called in the

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28. [2] John i. 1, 14. 1 Cor. i. 24.

Language of the New Testament, [3] *the Image of the invisible God* : That is, the visible Image, or delegated Representative in Power of the invisible God. For that this is the scriptural Meaning of the Word *Image*, when applied to the Image of an invisible Being, seems plain from many Passages, but in particular from that wherein it is said, that Man was created [4] *in the Image of God* : Because as soon as God is represented by *Moses* as having said; *Let us make Man in our Image after our Likeness* : Then immediately follows, *and let him have Dominion over the Fish of the Sea ; and over the Fowls of the Air, &c.* And therefore the *Arabic* Version of the Bible renders this last Sentence to this Purpose, that *by the Image which God enobled, he created him to have Dominion*. And the wise Son of *Sirach* observes, that [5] *the Lord created Men, and endued them with Strength, by themselves, and made them according to his Image ; and put the Fear of Man upon all Flesh, and gave him Dominion over Beasts and Fowls*. And that this Word, *Εἰκὼν* Image, when applied to

[3] Col. i. 15. [4] Gen. i. 26, 27. [5] Eccles. xvii.
1, 3, 4.

92 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

Persons, was generally understood to denote the one as being the Deputy or Representative of the other, in Power and Dominion, is plain from an Expression in *Basil* upon this very Subject. Where he manifestly useth this Word to signify a Viceroy : When, in Answer to this Objection, *But how then, if there are two distinct Persons (in the Godhead) do we not make two Gods ?* To which he answers, [6] *Why just as a King, and the Deputy of a King, do not make two Kings.*

XCV. And as the *Jews* supposed their *Logos* to be the same Person with that [7] *Angel of God's Presence*, who is represented in the Old Testament, as being the Guardian Angel of the Children of *Israel*, so also do the Scriptures of the New Testament suppose their *Logos*, or the Lord Jesus Christ to be that very Angel who brought Redemption to *Israel* ; and therefore St. *Paul*, speaking of the Deliverance of the *Israelites* from their *Egyptian* [8] Bondage,

[6] Ὅτι βασιλεὺς λέγεται καὶ ἡ τῆ βασιλείας ἐκείνη, καὶ ὁ υἱο βασιλεὺς. *Basil. De Spir. Sanct. c. xviii.*

[7] *Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. xxxiii. 2. Numb. xx. 16.*

[8] *1 Cor. x. 1—9.*

faith,

saith, *Moreover, Brethren, I would not have you ignorant, how that all our Fathers were under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the Cloud, and in the Sea; and did all eat the same spiritual Meat; and did all drink the same spiritual Drink: For they drank of that same spiritual Rock that followed them, AND THAT ROCK WAS CHRIST.* He also saith, that by their Misconduct in the Wilderness, *they tempted Christ, and were therefore destroyed of Serpents.* And in his Epistle to the [9] *Hebrews*, he attributes the Perseverance of *Moses* in quitting *Pharaoh's Court*, in Obedience to the Commands of the *Jehovah-Angel*, and refusing to be called the Son of *Pharaoh's Daughter*, to his esteeming *the Reproach of Christ*, i. e. the [1] *Reproach of the Egyptians* for *Christ's sake*, *greater Riches than the Treasures in Egypt.*

XCVI. And as the *Jews* held their *Logos* to have been in the Beginning with God; and to be *δεύτερον Θεόν*, a second God:

[9] Heb. xi. 26. [1] This Method of speaking was very customary among the *Hebrews*. See Psal. lxxxix. 50. Gal. vi. 17. 1 Pet. iv. 13.

94 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

So also do the Scriptures of the New Testament acknowledge their *Logos*, or the Lord Jesus, to be called [1] *Emanuel*, which being interpreted is, *God with us*. He is therefore frequently, in the Language of the New Testament, spoken of as such. Thus *John* the Evangelist positively says, that [2] *the Word was God*. And *St. Paul* calls him, [3] *God manifested in the Flesh*. And *St. Thomas*, when speaking to him, fully and positively calleth him, [4] *my Lord and my God*.

XCVII. But then these Scriptures are in other Places very expressive, with regard to the Superiority of God the Father, over God the Son : Thus *St. Peter*, in that Speech which he makes to the *Jews*, *Acts* ii. 33. where he is applying a Passage, out of the cxth *Psalms*, to our Saviour, says, *For David is not ascended into the Heavens : But he saith himself*, “ The Lord “ said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my “ Right Hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Footstool.” Therefore, says *St. Peter*, *let all the House of Israel know*

[1] Matth. i. 23. [2] John i. 1. [3] 1 Tim. iii. 16.
[4] John xx. 28.

assuredly,

assuredly, that God hath MADE that same Jesus whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ. Which shews that the Son could not have been from all Eternity co-equal to the Father, since the Father could not have made him either Lord or Christ, if he had no Superiority over him. And accordingly, St. Paul applies that Text of Scripture to Jesus Christ, which David maketh use of in the Psalms, when he saith, [6] Thy Throne, O GOD, is for ever and ever ; a Sceptre of Righteousness is the Sceptre of thy Kingdom : Thou hast loved Righteousness and hated Iniquity ; therefore God, EVEN THY GOD, hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows. In which Passage, though Christ is undoubtedly called God, yet the Superiority of God the Father over this God, is manifestly preserved ; because he is called even his God. And the Lord Jesus Christ, when he was departing out of this Life, not only [7] offered up Prayers and Supplications unto the Father, as unto him that was able to save him from Death ; but also [8] cried with a loud Voice, saying, MY GOD, MY GOD, why hast thou forsaken me ?

[6] Heb. i. 8. [7] Heb. v. 7. [8] Matth. xxvii. 46.

XCVIII. I am not ignorant, that in order to invalidate this Argument, it is said, that this last Expression was spoken only in regard to his human Nature, with respect to which he was undoubtedly inferior to God the Father ; but in answer to this, it is to be observed, that in the first Passage here alluded to in the cxth Psalm, our Saviour is there called *Lord*, and yet *Jehovah* is said by St. *Peter*, to have made him both *Lord* and *Christ*. And in the second Passage here quoted, the Psalmist speaks of him as *God*, yet at the same Time declares God the Father to be his God. And the same Method of speaking is continued in the Scriptures, not only while he was here in this World, subject to Mortality ; but after he had overcome Death, and the Grave, even after his Resurrection ; at which Time, he also acknowledges God the Father to be his God : For when *Mary* would have approached unto him, he said, [9] *Touch me not*, or, do not stay to touch or mind me at present, *for I am not yet ascended unto my Father ; but go to my Brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my*

[9] John xx. 17.

Father,

Father, and your Father, UNTO MY GOD, AND YOUR GOD. And the Apostle *Paul*, in speaking of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, even after his Ascension, after his Exaltation, after he had been seated [1] *at the Right Hand of God, far above all Principality, and Power, and Might, and Dominion*, speaks of God the Father, as still being *his God*. For says he, [2] *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. And again, he saith to the *Ephesians*, *Wherefore*, I cease not to give Thanks for you, that *the God of our Lord Jesus Christ*, the Father of Glory, may give unto you the Spirit of Wisdom. And in the Revelation of *St. John*, the Apostle speaking of *Jesus*, saith, [3] *who hath made us Kings and Priests TO HIS GOD AND FATHER.*

XCIX. And indeed the whole Conduct and Behaviour and Doctrine of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, while he was in this World, was correspondent thereto; for he not only speaks of the Superiority of God the Father in general Words, as when he says, in express Terms, [4] *the Father is greater*

[1] Eph. i. 20, 21. [2] Eph. i. 3. [3] Τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἀντὶ, Rev. i. 6. [4] John xiv. 28. x. 29.

98 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

than I; and again, the Father is greater than all: But acknowledges that his whole Conduct, not only while he was in this World, but before he came into it, before he had taken human Nature upon himself, was in Submission to the Will and Commands of God. For he acknowledges, in numberless Places, that it was the Father who sent him, and gave him a Commandment what to do. [5] For, says he, I must work the Work of him that SENT me; and again he says, The Father which SENT me, he GAVE ME A COMMANDMENT, what I should say, and what I should speak. And again, As the Father GAVE ME COMMANDMENT, so do I. We may therefore fairly argue, as our Saviour himself does upon another Occasion, that [6] as the Servant is not equal to his Lord, neither is he that is sent equal to him that sent him. He therefore also acknowledged, that all the Power he was possessed of, not only natural, but supernatural, was received from the Father, and was [7] given unto him. And this not only while he was upon Earth,

[5] John ix. 4. xii. 49. xiv. 31, &c. &c. [6] John xiii. 16. [7] John v. 26. xvii. 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, &c. &c.

while

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 99

while he was clogged and fettered with the Shackles of Mortality: But even after his Resurrection, and Ascension, and Exaltation, he declares, that all the Power which he had in Heaven and Earth, was [8] *given unto him* of the Father. And some Years after that, *St. Paul*, in his Epistle to the [9] *Corinthians*, saith, *But I would have you know, that the Head of every Man is Christ; and the Head of the Woman is the Man; and the HEAD OF CHRIST IS GOD.*

C. And as *Moses* was commanded by God to obey the Voice of the *Angel*, which he sent to keep him in the Way; and to provoke him not, because *his Name was in him*; so the Lord *Jesus Christ* declares, that the Honour which is due unto him is on the Father's Account; that is, because he was sent from the Father: For, says he, [1] *The Father hath committed all Judgment to the Son, that all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*: And then he adds the Reason, *For, he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him.*

[8] Matth. xxviii. 18. [9] 1 Cor. xi. 3. [1] John v. 22, 23.

CI. It is likewise very remarkable, that in this Place, as well as in *Exodus* xxiii. 21, where God ordereth *Moses* and the *Israelites* to obey the Angel which was sent in his Name, the Incitement offered for *honouring* the one, as well as *obeying* the other, is the Power of *Judgment*, that was committed unto them. For, says God to *Moses*, *Beware of him, obey his Voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your Transgressions.* And in the New Testament, our Saviour observes, that ALL JUDGMENT WAS COMMITTED TO THE SON; *that all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.*

CII. It is a Remark made by Sir *Isaac Newton*, that the Worship which is due from Man to God, is on account of the Dominion he hath over him. For, says he, “ [3] God is a relative Term, which “ has Reference to Subjects, and the Word “ Deity, denotes the Dominion of God, “ not over his own Body, (as the ancient “ Philosophers imagined, who called God

[3] Newt. *Prin. Schol. gener.*

“ the Soul of the World) but over Subjects.” And again, he saith, “ We arrive at the “ Knowledge of God, by considering his “ Properties and Attributes ; by inquiring “ into the wise Formation and Constitution “ of all Things ; and searching into their “ final Causes ; but we worship and adore “ him on account of his Dominion.” So that the Son becometh our God, not so much on account of his having been employed in our Creation, and *that by him God created the Worlds*, as because *all Judgment is committed unto him*, this being the great *Obligation* of all Duty : There being no Reason for Men to lay themselves under any Restraint, in obeying or disobeying the Commands of any Being, which hath no Power over them.

CIII. Now the Reason why Almighty God was pleased to commit this Power of Judgment unto the Son, is also assigned ; for, says our Lord Jesus, [4] *The Father, hath given to the Son Authority to execute Judgment ; because he is the Son of Man.* That is, as a Reward for having taken hu-

[4] John v. 26, 27.

man Nature upon him. For, upon the Fall of *Adam*, this Son of God, being willing to undertake the Redemption of Mankind, [5] *he was* accordingly [6] ANOINTED of God for to do whatsoever his Hand and his Council predetermined to be done. That is, he was [7] *anointed* to do and to suffer, whatsoever it should please God for him to do or to suffer. And for an Encouragement in which Undertaking, God was pleased to propose to this his anointed Son, that, on the Performance of such Things as God should appoint for him to do, he should be exalted to [8] *Joy and Glory*.

CIV. When therefore, in the Fulness of Time, it pleased God to send forth his Son, who being [9] *in the Form of God* nevertheless divested himself of that Glory which he had with the Father before the World was, and [1] *came down from Heaven*, not

[5] Acts iv. 27, 28. [6] Hence called the *Messiah*, which literally signifies the *anointed*. [7] Or *appointed*. This Term of *anointing* being made use of, instead of *appointing*, in compliance with the human Custom of *anointing* Persons, when they were *appointed* to the Administration of particular Offices, such as either *King*, *Priest*, or *Prophet*. See 1 Sam. xiii. 1. 2 Sam. ii. 7. Exod. xxix. 7. Isai. lxi. 1. [8] Heb. xii. 2. 1 Pet. i. 11. [9] Phil. ii. 6. [1] 1 John iv. 34. v. 30. vi. 38, 42.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 103

to do his own Will, but the Will of him that sent him; [2] The Spirit having testified beforehand the Sufferings of Christ, and the Glory that should follow; he therefore [3] for the Joy that was set before him, endured the Cross, despising the Shame: [4] Wherefore God also hath highly EXALTED him, and [5] set him at his own Right-hand EXALTED, [6] and hath given him a Name that is above every Name, that [7] IN THE NAME OF JESUS every Knee should bow, of Things in Heaven, and Things in Earth, and Things under the Earth: And that every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is LORD to the Glory of GOD the Father.

CV. Wherefore Jesus having [8] finished the Work which his Father gave him to do, and manifested his Name unto Men, that they might know God the Father the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; and having persisted therein unto Death, [9] that he might reconcile both Jews and Gentiles unto God in one Body by

[2] 1 Pet. i. 11. [3] Heb. xii. 2. [4] Phil. ii. 9.
[5] Acts ii. 33. Eph. i. 20, &c. [6] Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11.
[7] Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι. [8] John xvii. 4. vi. 3. [9] Eph. ii. 16.

the Cross : And having been [1] *for the Suffering of Death crowned with Glory and Honour* ; instead of the Portion of *Israel*, which had been before the Line or Boundary of his Inheritance ; he had now [2] *Power given him over all Flesh*. And [3] *all Nations* were made of one Blood under him, and *the Bounds of their Habitations* were brought within the Line of his Inheritance : And [4] *there was given unto him Dominion and Glory, and a Kingdom, that all People, Nations, and Languages should serve him*.

CVI. From this Time forth, therefore, his Disciples were sent unto [5] *all Nations* to [6] *preach the Gospel unto every Creature*. And what is remarkable is, that, from this Time, the same *Holy Spirit*, which under the *Mosaical* Dispensation [7] spake by the Prophets, and had only illuminated the Minds of those of the Sons of *Israel*, to whom the *Word of God* came, was, through the Intercession of *Jesus Christ*, conferred

[1] Heb. ii. 9. [2] John xvii. 2. [3] Acts xvii. 26.
 [4] Dan. vii. 14. [5] Matt. xxviii. 10. [6] Mark xvi. 15.
 [7] 2 Pet. i. 21. and Nicene Creed.

upon all Mankind that believe on him, of what Nation soever they be, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*; and *shed forth* his benign Influence on all those who come to God through *Jesus Christ*: That [8] *through him both Jews and Gentiles may have an Access by one Spirit unto the Father*. That [9] *the Blessing of Abraham*, wherein it was promised, that in his Seed should all the Nations of the Earth be blessed, *might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that they might receive the Promise of the Spirit through Faith*: And that [1] *all might be baptized into one Body, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, whether they be bond or free, and might all be made to drink into one Spirit*.

CVII. When therefore *Jesus Christ the Lord* was raised from the Dead, and formally invested in the Possession of that Kingdom which [2] *the Father had appointed unto him*; having received from the Father the Promise of the Holy Spirit, he *shed forth this Holy Spirit* [3] *abundantly*, as well upon the [4] *Gentiles as the Jews*,

[8] Eph. ii. 18. [9] Gal. iii. 14. [1] 1 Cor. xii. 13.
[2] Luke xxii. 29. [3] Tit. iii. 6. [4] Acts xi. 15.

106 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

putting no Difference between them. Which Holy Spirit is sometimes in the Language of the Scriptures of the New Testament, called *the Spirit of God* the Father, because he [5] proceedeth from the Father who sent him unto us ; and sometimes *the Spirit of the Son*, or *the Spirit of Christ*, because it was by the Intercession of *Jesus the Christ* that the Supply of this Holy Spirit was sent unto us ; and is also called [6] *the Spirit of Truth*, because it was sent to *guide Mankind into all Truth*.

CVIII. Now St. *John* plainly calleth that *Holy Spirit*, by which he was inspired with the Book of *Revelations*, an *Angel*. For his Words are these, [7] *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his Servants Things which must shortly come to pass ; and he sent and signified it by HIS ANGEL unto his Servant John*. And yet through this whole Book, he calls this Revelation, the Dictates of the Spirit. [8] *He that bath Ears to hear*, says he, *let him hear what the SPIRIT saith unto the*

[5] John xv. 26. [6] John xvi. 13. xiv. 26. 1 John ii. 20, 27. [7] Rev. i. 1. [8] Rev. ii. 7, 11, 17, 19. iii. 6, 13, 22.

Churches. And it is very remarkable, that although the *Virgin Mary* is positively said to have been [9] *found with Child of the Holy Spirit*, and to have *conceived of the Holy Spirit*; yet the Person sent to her from God upon this Occasion, calls himself *an Angel*, and in particular, [1] *the Angel Gabriel that standeth in the Presence of God*; who under the old Covenant had been sent to inspire [2] *Daniel* with Skill and Understanding.

CIX. Which [3] *Angel GABRIEL* being sent from God unto the *Virgin Mary*, *The ANGEL*, says *St. Luke*, *came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: Blessed art thou among Women. Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy Womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his Name Jesus. Then said Mary unto the ANGEL, How shall this be, seeing I know not a Man? And the ANGEL answered and said unto her, THE HOLY SPIRIT shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also*

[9] *Matt.* i. 18, 20. [1] *Luke* i. 19, 26. [2] *Dan.* viii. 16. ix. 21. [3] *Luke* i. 26.

that holy Thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God. And Mary said, Behold the Handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy Word.

CX. Which is all the Account we have of this Affair, but that after she returned from her Cousin *Elizabeth's*, where she had remained three Months [5] *she was found to be with Child, before she and Joseph, to whom she was espoused, had come together ; then Joseph her Husband being a [6] good-natured Man, and not willing to make her a publick Example, was minded to put her away privately. But while he thought on these Things, behold THE ANGEL of the Lord appeared unto him in a Dream, saying, Joseph, thou Son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy Wife : For that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit. Then Joseph, being raised from his Sleep, did as the ANGEL of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his Wife : And knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born Son.*

[5] Matt. i. 18, 19, 20. [6] *Δίκαιος*. This Word is often used to signify a *good-natured* Person, in which Sense also the Word *justus* is frequently used in the *Latin* Tongue. And in this Sense this Word ought to be understood, Acts x. 22. 1 John i. 9.

CXI. The pre-existent Spirit of the *Logos* being therefore, by the wonderful Power and Will of God, conveyed into the Womb of the Virgin by the Ministration of the Holy Spirit, she conceived and brought forth *Jesus*: By which Union of that exalted Spirit with human Nature, the *Logos* became incarnate, and was made Man. Which *Logos* did, by this Piece of Condescension, so far ἐκένωσε ἑαυτὸν, [7] *empty himself*, and divest himself of that Glory of his antecedent State, which he had with the Father, before the World was, that, Sin only excepted, he became liable and subject to all the Infirmities of our Nature. And therefore, during the Time of his Continuance here upon Earth, he is represented all along as being under the Guidance and Conduct of the *Holy Spirit*.

CXII. He is accordingly said to have been [8] *led up of the Spirit into the Wilderness to be tempted of the Devil*: And that when the [9] *Devil had ended his Temptation*, *Jesus returned in the Power of the*

[7] Phil. ii. 7. [8] Matth. iv. 1. [9] Luke iv.
13, 14.

110 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

Spirit into Galilee. That afterwards, he [1] cast out Devils by the Spirit of God, which [2] descended upon him at his Baptism in a [3] visible Manner, and abode upon him for some Time. He is therefore said to have been [4] anointed with the Holy Spirit, and with Power : And that when he was in an Agony praying with Vehemence to God, that, if possible, the Cup of his Afflictions might pass from him, [5] an Angel appeared unto him from Heaven, strengthening him : That it was through [6] the eternal Spirit, that he offered himself without Spot to God upon the Cross : That when he was in the Grave, he was [7] quickened by the Spirit, and [8] declared to be the Son of God with Power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the Resurrection from the Dead.

[1] Matth. xii. 8. [2] John i. 22. [3] *i. e.* By the Descent of a lucid shining Appearance, which alighted, and rested upon him, ὡς εἰς περιστερὰν, *as a Dove*. Not that this alludes to the Form and Figure of the Appearance, as if it was in the Shape of a Dove ; but to the Manner of its Descent, which descended and alighted upon our Saviour, as a Dove descends and lights upon any thing. See Sect. lxxxii. and *Whitby* on *Luke* iii. 26. [4] Acts x. 38. See Note in Sect. ciii. [5] *Luke* xxii. 42, 43. [6] Heb. ix. 14. [7] 1 *Pet.* iii. 18. [8] *Rom.* iii. 4.

CXIII. And indeed it does not appear, either in the Old or New Testament, that the *Logos* had any Power over the Holy Spirit, till after his Ascension, [9] when *all Power was given unto him, both in Heaven and Earth*. For, said Jesus to his Disciples, [1] *It is expedient for you, that I go away; for if I go not away, the COMFORTER will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you*. For, [2] *I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of Truth, [3] which proceedeth from the Father: Whom I will send to you from the Father*. For, as St. John remarks, [4] *the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified*. He therefore, after his Resurrection, commanded his Disciples [5] *not to depart from Jerusalem, till after his Ascension, but to wait for the Promise of the Father*. Which having [6] *received of the Father, he shed it forth upon them*. From which Time, *this Spirit* is indifferently called *the Spirit of*

[9] Matth. xxviii. 18, 19. [1] John xvi. 7.

[2] John xiv. 16. [3] John xv. 26. [4] John vii. 39.

[5] Luke xxiv. 49. Acts i. 4. [6] Acts ii. 33.

God, and [7] *the Spirit of Christ*, or [8] *the Spirit of the Son*; because the Son had now obtained Power of the Father, to send him, not to the *Jews* only, but also to the *Gentiles*; that all Nations might be baptized, [9] *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*; [1] *that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit*. It seems therefore highly reasonable, that we should pay divine Homage to that Holy Spirit in Proportion to the Degree of Power which hath been delegated to him, from the Almighty; and that it is our Duty to pray to him, for the Communication of those *sanctifying* Graces, which he hath received Power from God the Father, through the Son, to distribute to his Disciples. I do not say that we ought to pray to him for the Forgiveness of our Sins, because [2] *all Judgment* hath not been *committed* unto him: But as he was undoubtedly sent, to be our [3] *Comforter*, to *guide us into all Truth*, and to *help our Infirmities*, surely we ought to pray to him, to comfort us, and to grant

[7] Rom. viii. 9. [8] Gal. iv. 6. [9] Matth. xxviii. 19. [1] Rom. xv. 16. [2] See Sect. lxxxv, c, ci, cii. [3] John xiv. 26. John xvi. 13. Rom. viii. 26.

us his Assistance, that we may be [4] *led by him*, and that we may, *of the Spirit, reap Life everlasting*. And as *the Manifestation of the Spirit was given to every Man to profit withal*; and as *to one is given by the Spirit the Word of Wisdom, and to another, the Word of Knowledge, by the same Spirit, dividing to every Man severally as he will*; surely it is but reasonable, that we should apply to that Holy Spirit, who [5] *searcheth in our Hearts the deep Things of God*, to confer such a Portion of his Influence on our Minds, as may by Degrees [6] *quicken and strengthen us*, till we shall be at length *filled therewith*. Lest also on the other hand, by neglecting so manifest a Duty, we should thereby [7] *grieve and do such despite to the Spirit of Grace*, as entirely to *quench it*. See Sect. lxxxiv, lxxxv.

CXIV. I apprehend therefore, it is manifestly shewed in these Papers, that, from the Consideration of the Nature of Spirit, by the Light of Reason, it appears, there can be but one God, that is, one supreme

[4] Rom. viii. 14: Eph. vi. 8. 1 Cor. xii. 7, &c.

[5] 1 Cor. ii. 10. [6] 1 Pet. iii. 18. Eph. iii. 16. v. 8.

[7] Eph. iv. 3. Heb. x. 29. 1 Thess. v. 9.

114 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

intelligent Agent; which one God may, however, create an infinite Series of spiritual Agents, in Subordination one to another; some of which may, by an Authority communicated to them, from the supreme God, act *as Gods*, with regard to those inferior Beings who are committed into their Charge. I apprehend it likewise appears from the Sentiments of the *Jews*, as well as from the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, that this is the Method of Government, which the Almighty hath been pleased to pursue in the Oeconomy of this Universe; still reserving to himself that incommunicable Quality of *Supreme*, which it would be a Contradiction to suppose him divested of, either with or without his Will; that is, either by his own Consent, or by Necessity.

CXV. It may not therefore be improper to consider what was the Opinion of the most early Fathers of the Christian Church upon this Head; which though it ought to have no Weight against the express Dictates either of Reason or Revelation, yet, in Points not fully or distinctly revealed, the consulting of them is very proper and useful; as
they

they certainly are the best Evidence that can possibly be had of the Sentiments of the Church in their Times; and the nearer that those Fathers lived to the Times of the Apostles, they may justly be supposed to be the less liable to have varied from any of the Doctrines or Practices of the truly primitive Church.

CXVI. Now if we consult the Opinions of the Fathers upon this Subject, for the first three hundred Years after Christ, we shall find them all universally agreeing in the aforementioned Doctrine: As may appear by consulting *Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatian, Irenæus, the Author of the Recognitions, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dionysius of Alexandria, Lactantius, &c.* out of which it seems needless to produce any Quotations, as this Point is plainly given up by three of the most learned Persons of the last Age; two of whom being of a contrary Opinion from those Fathers, cannot be suspected of lightly giving up a Testimony of so much Consequence, if the Flagrancy of the Truth had not obliged them to it: And these are, the judicious Mr.

Chillingworth, the learned Bishop *Bull*, and the discerning Dr. *Cudworth*. The Opinion of Mr. *Chillingworth* is to be found in a Letter of his to a Friend, who desired to know what Judgment might be made of *Arianism*, from the Sense of Antiquity. In answer to which Mr. *Chillingworth* wrote the following Letter: “ I was mistaken in
 “ my directing you to *Eusebius* for the
 “ Matter you wott of. You shall find it in
 “ a Witness much farther from Exception
 “ herein than *Eusebius*; even *Athanasius*
 “ himself, the greatest Adversary of that
 “ Doctrine; and *Hilary*, who was his Se-
 “ cond. See the first in *Ep. de Synodis*
 “ *Arim. & Seleuc.* p. 917. D. *Tom.* 1. Edit.
 “ *Par.* 1627. See the second, *De Synodis*,
 “ *fol.* 97. In the first you shall find that
 “ the Eighty Fathers, which condemned *Sa-*
 “ *mosatenus*, affirmed expressly — *That the*
 “ *Son is not of the same Essence of the*
 “ *Father.* Which is to contradict formally
 “ the Council of *Nice*, which decreed *the*
 “ *Son coessential to the Father.* In the
 “ second you shall find these Words, to
 “ the same Purpose: — *Octoginta Epis-*
 “ *copi olim respuerunt ꝛ Homoousion.* See
 “ also, if you please, *Just. cont. Tryph.*
 “ p. 283.

AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT. 117

“ p. 283, 356, 357; *Tertullian* against
 “ *Praxeas*, cap. ix; *Novat. de Trin. in fine*,
 “ who is joined with *Tertul. Athanas. Ep.*
 “ *de fide div. Alex. tom. i. p. 551*; *Basil,*
 “ *tom. ii. p. 802, 803. Ed. Par. 1618.* See
 “ *St. Hierom, Apol. ii. contra Ruff. tom. ii.*
 “ *p. 329. Par. 1579.* See *Petav. upon*
 “ *Epiph. his Panar. ad Hæres. 69. quæ est*
 “ *Arii*, p. 285. And consider well how he
 “ clears *Lucian* the Martyr, from *Arianism*,
 “ and what he there confesses of all the an-
 “ cient Fathers.

“ If you could understand *French*, I
 “ would refer you to *Perron*, p. 633, of his
 “ Reply to King *James*; where you should
 “ find these Words: *If a Man should de-*
 “ *mand of an Arian, if he would submit to*
 “ *the Judgment of the Church of the Ages*
 “ *precedent to that of Constantine, he would*
 “ *make no Difficulty of it; but would press*
 “ *himself that the Controversy might be de-*
 “ *cided by that little which remains to us*
 “ *of the Authors of that Time. For an A-*
 “ *rian would find in Irenæus, Tertullian,*
 “ *and others which remain of those Ages,*
 “ *that the Son is the Instrument of the Fa-*
 “ *ther; that the Father commanded the Son*

118 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

“ in the Works of Creation; that the Fa-
 “ ther and the Son are ALIUD ET ALIUD,
 “ which Things be that should now hold,
 “ now when the Language of the Church is
 “ more examined, would be esteemed a very
 “ Arian.

“ If you read *Bellarmino* touching this
 “ Matter, you should find that he is trou-
 “ bled exceedingly to find any tolerable
 “ Glosses for the Speeches of the Fathers
 “ before the Council of *Nice*, which are
 “ against him; and yet he conceals the
 “ strongest of them, and to counterpoise
 “ them, cites Authors that have indeed anci-
 “ ent Names, but such as he himself has
 “ stigmatized for spurious or doubtful in his
 “ Book *De Script. Eccles.*

“ Were I at Leisure, and had a little
 “ longer Time, I could refer you to some
 “ that acknowledge *Origen's* Judgment to
 “ be also against them in this Matter. And
 “ *Fisher*, in his Answer to Dr. *White's* Nine
 “ Questions, has a Place almost parallel to
 “ the above cited out of *Perron*.

“ In

“ In a word, whosoever shall freely and
 “ impartially consider of this Thing, and
 “ how, on the other Side, the ancient Fa-
 “ thers Weapons against the *Arians* are in
 “ a Manner only Places of Scripture (and
 “ those now for the most part discarded as
 “ impertinent and unconcluding) and how,
 “ in the Argument drawn from the Autho-
 “ rity of the ancient Fathers, they are almost
 “ always Defendants, and scarce ever Op-
 “ ponents; he shall not choose, but confess,
 “ or at least be very inclinable to believe,
 “ that the Doctrine of *Arius* is either a
 “ Truth, or at least no damnable He-
 “ resy [7].”

The Words of Bishop *Bull*, when speak-
 ing of the Sentiments of *Origen* upon this
 Subject, are these: “ I conclude thus with
 “ myself, that *Origen*, who hath been so
 “ severely censured by Divines, both anci-
 “ ent and modern, was really *Catholic* in
 “ the Article of the sacred Trinity; al-
 “ though, in the manner of explaining that
 “ Article, he sometimes speaks otherwise,

[7] See the Life of Mr. *Chillingworth*, written by *Des Maizeaux*, p. 51.

“ than the *Catholicks* do; [8] *which is no*
 “ *more than almost all the Fathers did*
 “ *who lived before the Council of Nice.*”

As for Dr. *Cudworth*, he does not only give up the primitive Fathers, in their Expressions, but also in their Meaning. For, as he undoubtedly thought himself to be in the Right, he imagined those Fathers to have been in an Error; and makes use of this universal Consent of the ancient Fathers, of the Three first Centuries, in asserting the Dependence and Subjection of the Son to the Father, as an Argument in Proof of the Fallibility of the primitive Fathers of the Christian Church. For, says he, [9]
 “ Though it be true, that *Athanasius*,
 “ writing against the *Arians*, does appeal
 “ to the Tradition of the ancient Church,
 “ and, among others, cites *Origen's* Testi-
 “ mony; yet was this only for the Eter-
 “ nity and Divinity of the Son of God, but
 “ not at all for such an absolute Coequality
 “ of him with the Father, as would ex-

[8] Quod ipsi cum reliquis fere omnibus Patribus, qui Concilium Nicænum antecesserunt, commune fuit. Bulli *Def. Fid. Nic.* Sect. xi. c. 9. § 22.

[9] *Cud. Intell. Syst.* l. i. c. 4. p. 595.

“ clude

“ clude all *Dependence, Subordination*, and
 “ *Inferiority*: Those Ancients so unani-
 “ mously agreeing therein, that they are
 “ therefore by *Petavius* taxed with *Plato-*
 “ *nism*, and having, by that Means, cor-
 “ rupted the Purity of the Christian Faith,
 “ in this Article of the Trinity. Which
 “ how it can be reconciled with those other
 “ Opinions of Ecclesiastical Tradition be-
 “ ing a Rule of Faith, and the Impossi-
 “ bility of the visible Churches erring in
 “ any fundamental Point, cannot, says he,
 “ easily be understood.”

CXVII. For my own Part, I will readi-
 ly give up the Fallibility of the primitive
 Fathers, and whoever will but give himself
 the Trouble of perusing their Writings, will
 soon be convinced, that they were fallible
 Men; and I therefore only make use of their
 Testimony in this Point, to shew what was
 the Sense of the Church in their Days, of
 which their own Writings are an infallible
 Proof; whether they were fallible in them-
 selves or not.

CXVIII. But *Petavius*, says *Cudworth*,
 taxed the primitive Fathers with *Platonism*,
 and

and with having, by that Means, corrupted the Purity of the Christian Faith. That many of the primitive Fathers were bred up in the Schools of the *Platonic* Philosophers can hardly be denied; and that they would be inclined to endeavour to reconcile their own Principles and those of the Christian Religion together, is more than probable. It is also certain, that the *Pagans* held the Doctrine of a *Trinity*, and made use of that Word to express it by; but if it can be proved, that they held a Subordination in the Persons of the *Trinity*, before Christianity appeared in the World, and that all the primitive Christians, whether *Platonists* or not, held also the Doctrine of a Subordination of Power, in the Persons of the *Trinity*, for the first Three hundred Years after *Christ*; then the more probable Consequence to be drawn from thence, is this, That the Doctrine of the Trinity, as held by the primitive Christians, coinciding with the Doctrine of the Trinity, as held by the *Pagans* in general, and by the *Platonists* in particular, wherein a Subordination of Power between the Three Persons of the Trinity was a fundamental Principle, this might be one main Reason, why the *Platonists* were
so

so ready to embrace the Christian Religion : And not that they corrupted it after they had embraced it ; since, had their Principles, and the *Christians* on this Subject originally differed, the *Platonists* would not have been so easily made Converts.

CXIX. It may therefore not be improper at present to set before the Reader a short Sketch of the Doctrine of the *Pagan* Trinity, from whence will appear the Truth of what I have just now asserted.

CXX. The Opinion of the *Egyptians* concerning the Trinity, may be found in *Jamblichus*, who delivers it unto us. For in the Beginning of the Eighth Section, he makes *Porphyry* ask, “ What do the *Egyptians* say is the *First Cause*? Is it Intellectual, or something above Intellect? Or, is it one only Being, or is it two, or more? Or, is it corporeal, or incorporeal? Or, is it the same with the Creator of this Universe, or something superior? In short, were all Things produced by One, or by Many?” To which *Jamblichus* answereth, *Πρὸ τῶν ὄντως ὄντων, καὶ τῶν ὅλων ἀρχῶν ἐστὶ θεὸς εἷς, πρῶτος καὶ τῶν πρώτων θεὸς καὶ βασιλέως, ἀκίνητος ἐν μονότητι τῆς ἐαυτοῦ ἐνότητος μένων,*

124 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

μένων, ἔτε γὰρ νοητὸν αὐτῷ ἐπιπλέκειται, ἔτε ἄλλο
 τί. Παράδειγμα δὲ ἵδρυσαι τῷ αὐτῷ πατρὶ, αὐτογόνῳ, καὶ μονοπάτορος Θεῷ, τῷ ὅλῳ ἀγαθῷ.
 Μείζον γάρ τι καὶ πρῶτον καὶ πηλὴ τῶν πάντων,
 καὶ πυθμὴν τῶν νοημένων πρῶτων εἰδῶν ὄντων.
 Ἀπὸ δὲ τῷ ἐνὸς τέτε, ὁ αὐτάρχης Θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐξέ-
 λαμψε· διὸ καὶ αὐτοπάτωρ, καὶ αὐτάρχης. Ἀρχὴ
 γὰρ αὐτὸς καὶ Θεὸς Θεῶν· μονὰς ἐκ τῷ ἐνὸς, πρὸ
 ἐσίας καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐσίας· ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἡ ἐσιό-
 τῃς καὶ ἡ ἐσία· διὸ γὰρ νοητὰρχης προσαγορεύεται.
 Αὗται μὲν οὖν εἰσιν ἀρχαὶ πρεσβυτάται πάντων,
 ὡς Ἑρμῆς πρὸ τῶν αἰθερίων καὶ ἐμπυρίων Θεῶν
 προσάττει, καὶ τῶν ἐπερρανίων. Which is thus
 rendered into *Latin*, by Mr. Gale: *Ante eas*
res quæ vere sunt, et ante Principia univer-
salium, est Deus unus, prior etiam primo
Deo et Rege; est ille immobilis in solitudine
sue Unitatis permanens, neque enim intel-
lectuale ei miscetur, neque aliquid aliud, estque
exemplar sui ipsius patris, de se geniti et uni-
pater Deus; et vere bonus. Est enim majus
quid et prius, Fons omnium et Radix intel-
ligibilium Idearum primarum Entium. Ab
hoc autem uno, Deus, per se sufficiens se ipse
explicavit; proinde est sui Pater et sibi suf-
ficiens. Est enim hic et Principium, et
Deus Deorum, Unitas ex uno, ante essentiam,
et Essentiæ Principium; nam ab eo fluit En-
titas

titas & Essentia, quapropter Noetarcha dicitur. Hæc igitur sunt Principia omnium antiquissima, quæ Mercurius supra Deos æthereos & empyreos, & cælestes constituit.

CXXI. I would have translated this Passage into *English*, if I could; but there are some Parts of it, which seem to me so superintelligible, that I thought it advisable to give it in the Author's own Words; and refer the *English* Translation of it to some of those Deistical Admirers of the Plainness and Simplicity of the Religion of Nature, who cannot bear the Thoughts of any Thing that is mysterious in Revealed Religion.

CXXII. Abstruse and dark however, as it is, we may be furnished by it with some Light towards the Explanation of some Expressions in the *Pythagorean* Trinity, as it is given us by [1] *Simplicius*, in his Comment on *Aristotle*, out of *Moderatus the Pythagorean*: τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐν ὑπὲρ τὸ ὄν καὶ πᾶσαν ἔσian ἀποφαίνειν· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἐν ὅπέρ ἐστι τὸ ὄνως ὄν, καὶ νοητὸν, τὰ εἶδη φησὶν εἶναι· τὸ δὲ τρίτον, ὅπέρ ἐστι ψυχικόν, μέλειεν τῷ ἐνός, καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν. For it

[1] *Simpl. in Phys. Arist. fol. 50.*

is plain that the *πρῶτον ἐν ὑπὲρ τὸ ἐν καὶ πᾶσαν ἔσιν*, of the *Pythagoreans*, that is, *the First One who is above Being, and all Existence*, is the same (I had almost said *Being*) with that God of the *Egyptians*, who being prior to the First God, is *Super-Intelligible*. That the *τὸ δεύτερον ἐν ὧς ἐστὶ τὸ ὄντως ὄν, καὶ νοητὸν, τὰ εἶδη φησὶν εἶναι*. That is, *the Second One who is existence itself, and Intelligence, and is called IDEA*, is that First, or rather Second God aforementioned, who according to the *Egyptians*, having unfolded himself, came forth into Being, and was self-begotten, and was equally his own Father and his own Son, who is the Principle of all Existence, and of all Intelligence. As to the *τὸ τρίτον ἐν* or *Third One*, of the *Pythagoreans*, which they call *ψυχικόν*, or *Animal*, that answers to the third and lower Class of the Empyrean and Æthereal Deities, who are supposed to preside over several Parts of this Universe, being as it were the Souls of this World.

CXXIII. The *Platonic Trinity*, as it was digested into Form by the Disciples of *Plato*, was not very different from this. There is indeed no one Passage in *Plato*,

where his Notion of a Deity is delivered explicitly, and reduced into a regular System. For, either out of Fear of his Countrymen, or because he was not settled in his own Notions, or both, he speaks very obscurely on this Subject. That Treatise which he entitles *Timæus*, is the most copious on this Head, and therein he speaks plainly of [2] one sempiternal and unoriginated God. Which God, says *Plato*, when he reasoned within himself about a future God, made this Universe, and placed this [3] perfectly happy God which he begat, as the Soul in the Middle of it.

CXXIV. Which God though he frequently mentions as a created Being, yet he styles him also [4] *the IMAGE of Intelligence*, or of the most intelligent God; *the greatest and best; the most beautiful, and the most perfect*, and *the only-begotten God*. Which Universe, says *Plato*, when he had thus made and [5] contemplated, he rejoiced

[2] τὸ δὲ αἰὲς, γένεσιν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον.

[3] εὐδαίμονα θεὸν αὐτὸν ἐγενήσατο.

[4] Ἐικόνα τῆ νοῦς μέγιστον καὶ ἀριστον, κάλλιστον καὶ τελειότατον, and μοιογενῆ.

[5] Whoever reads this, I think, cannot avoid being convinced that *Plato* herein imitates the Account which *Moses*.

ced over it. He then made *Time*, and [6] formed the Sun and Moon, and five other Planets, to be the Measures thereof. But as there were yet no Animals, therefore God formed what was wanting, by a *secondary Imitation of the first Exemplar*: πρὸς τὴν τῆ παραδείγματος ἀποτυπόμενος φύσιν. Which is plainly borrowed from that Doctrine among the *Jews*, wherein they asserted Man not to be made in the Image of the Supreme God, but of the Second God. The Words of *Philo Judæus*, as they are quoted by *Eusebius*, are, Θνητὸν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀπεικονισθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πάσι τῶν ὄλων ἐδύνατο, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον Θεὸν, ὃς ἐκείνους λόγους. *Nihil enim mortale in summi illius & rerum universarum Parentis imaginem consignari potest, sed in imaginem Secundi Dei, hoc est, ejus Verbi, potest.* Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. vii. cap. 13.

CXXV. *Plato* then, in compliance with the orthodox Notion of his Country, and

gives of the Creation, which he signifies with saying, *And God saw every Thing that he had made, and behold it was very good.* Gen. i. 31.

[6] "Ἡλιος καὶ Σελήνη, καὶ πέντε ἄλλα ἄστρα, ἐπὶ πλὴν ἑξοχῆ Πλάνητες, εἰς διορισμὸν καὶ φυλακὴν ἀριθμῶν χρόνου γέγονεν. See Gen. i. 14; of which this is almost a Translation.

for

for Fear of the Fate of *Socrates*, says, But as to other Gods which are called [7] *Dæmons*, to speak properly of their Origin, or even to conceive it, is above the Reach of our Faculties; it is therefore our Duty to believe those our Ancestors, who, having unfolded their Natures, affirm them to be the Offspring of the Gods; and so to submit ourselves to the ancient Laws and Customs. And then he introduces the God who [8] framed all Things, as speaking to these *Dæmons*, *Saturn*, *Ops*, *Jupiter*, &c. whom he calls [9] the Gods begotten by himself; and empowers them to be his Instruments in the Production of Animals, and [1] to imitate that Virtue which he had exercised in their Origin.

CXXVI. Whence it is plain, that *Plato* was afraid to speak out; but his Disciples, by degrees, gathering Courage, his System was reduced into Form, before the Time

[7] See Sect. xxxv.

[8] Ὁς τὸ πᾶν γενήσας.

[9] Τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ γενήμασι.

[1] Μιμούμενοι τὴν ἑμὴν δύναμιν περὶ τὴν ὑμῶν γένεσιν.

of [2] *Porphyry*, who in his Fourth Book of the History of Philosophy, says, "Ἀρχὴ τῶν ὑποστάσεων, ἔφη Πλάτων, τὸ τῷ Θεῷ προελθεῖν ὁσίαν εἶναι δὲ τὸ μὴ ἀνώτατον Θεὸν τὸ Ἀγαθόν, μετ' αὐτῷ δὲ καὶ δεύτερον τὸν Δημιουργόν, τρίτην δὲ τὴν τῷ κόσμου ψυχὴν. *Usque ad tres Hypostases, dicit Plato, Dei progredi Essentiam; Et esse quidem dicit Deum summe bonum; post illum autem secundum Conditorem; tertium autem Mundi Animam.*

CXXVII. *Porphyry* was reckoned the most learned *Platonist* of his Age; and flourished about the Time when the substantial Doctrine of the Trinity began to make a Noise; and therefore his Sense of the *Platonic* Doctrine, is so much the more for our Purpose. It appears therefore from hence, that the *Platonic* and *Pythagorean* Doctrine of the Trinity, did not differ very widely at this Time one from the other, and that That God of the *Egyptians*, which was prior to the first, or the *Πρῶτον ἐν* of the *Pythagoreans*, was the

[2] *Porphyry* flourished about the latter End of the third Century. His Books were afterwards ordered to be burnt; but the Quotation which I have here produced may be found in St. *Cyril's* Treatise against *Julian*, B. viii.

same with the τὸ ἐν, and the τὸ ἀγαθὸν of the *Platonists*. The God of *Existence*, *Ideas*, or *Intelligence*, according to the *Egyptians*, or the τὸ δεύτερον ἐν of the *Pythagoreans*, which they also called εἶδη, *Idea*, being by the *Platonists* called νῆς and λόγος; i. e. *Mind* and *Reason*, or *Wisdom*. And the inferior Class of ætherial Deities, who were considered as the Soul of the World, among the *Egyptians*, answering to the τρίτον ἐν or the ἐν Ψυχικόν of the *Pythagoreans*, being called Ψυχὴ, i. e. the *Soul*, by the *Platonists*.

CXXVIII. They agreed also in the Offices which were assigned to these *Three Gods*. For the first was asserted to be ὑπὲρ above all Existence and Intelligence. The Second God was Existence and Intelligence itself, and the Communicator of them to other Beings: He is therefore represented by them as the Δημιουργός, the *Fabricator*, and Maker of this Frame of the Universe. The Third God, who is said to partake both of the First and Second Ἐν, or God, was held to be the *Soul* of the World, vivifying and enlivening it.

CXXIX. Hence it is plain, however, that the Disciples of *Plato* had varied from their Master's Plan. Because he positively asserts the one unoriginated God to have made this Universe, and therefore frequently calls him the [3] Δημιουργός. He likewise positively asserts the Second, that is, the God who was begotten by the one unoriginated God, to have been placed by him in the Middle of this round Universe, as [4] *the Soul* of it.

CXXX. It is nevertheless manifest, beyond all Controversy, that both *Plato* and his Disciples held a Kind of essential Subordination to have existed between these Gods, as the *Hebrews* undoubtedly did. And therefore I suppose them to have been more easily converted to the *Christian* Religion than they otherwise would have been.

CXXXI. And accordingly, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, one of those primitive Fathers, whom *Cudworth* allows to have acknowledged a Subordination in the Persons of

[3] *Plato* in *Timæo*. [4] *Id. ibid.*

the Trinity, when speaking concerning a Passage in *Plato*, says, [5] “ *I understand this no otherwise, than that the holy Trinity is signified thereby, the THIRD being the Holy Spirit, and the SECOND the Son, by whom all Things were made, according to the Will of the FATHER.*” This Passage, to which *Clemens* refers, is to be found in the second Epistle of *Plato* to *Dionysius*, on account of his having complained, that *Plato* was not explicit enough in what he said about the *First Cause*; to whom *Plato* says, “ That these Things must be spoken of in a kind of *Riddle*; that if any Accident should happen to these Papers, either by Land or Sea, he that finds them may not be able to understand them. The Thing therefore, says he, stands thus: *Περὶ τῶν πάντων βασιλέα πάντ' ἐσι, καὶ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα πάντα. καὶ ἐκεῖνος αἴτιον ἀπάντων τῶν καλῶν. δεύτερον δέ, περὶ τὰ δεύτερα, καὶ τρίτον περὶ τὰ τρίτα.*” *Circa omnium Regem sunt omnia, & illius Causa omnia: & ipse est omnium rerum pulchrarum Causa: Secundum ad Secunda, Tertium ad Tertia.* Which Fear of a Discovery accounts for the seeming Contradic-

[5] *Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. v. p. 710. edit. Pot.*

tions in *Plato*, and the Darkneſs in which his Theology is involved, and ſhews that his Diſciples were indeed obliged to pick his Doctrines out of *Riddles*, as he himſelf expreſſeth it.

CXXXII. But [6] St. *Cyril of Alexandria*, who was of the contrary Opinion from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, that is, who held a Co-equality in the Perſons of the Trinity, for he lived in the fifth Century, and, about 100 Years after the Council of *Nice*, wherein the Conſubſtantiality of the Father and the Son was firſt eſtabliſhed in the *Chriſtian* Church; *Cyril*, I ſay, when ſpeaking of the *Platonic* Philoſophy, [7] ſays, “ There
 “ would have been nothing at all wanting
 “ to the *Platonic* Trinity, for an absolute
 “ Agreement of it with the *Chriſtian*, had
 “ they but accommodated the right Notion
 “ of *Conſubſtantiality* to their three *Hypoſ-*
 “ *taſes*; ſo that there might have been but
 “ one ſpecific Nature or Eſſence of the God-
 “ head, not diſtinguiſhable by any natural
 “ Diverſity, and ſo no one *Hypoſtaſis* any
 “ way inferior or ſubordinate to another.”

[6] *Cyril cont. Jul.* lib. viii. [7] *Idem, ibid.*

CXXXIII. As for the Doctrine of the *three Hypostases*, which is here mentioned by *Cyril*, that was not the Doctrine of the Council of *Nice*, but was the Doctrine of the *Arians*, as well as of the *Platonists*. It was indeed afterwards adopted by some of the *Consubstantialists*, and was inserted in that Creed which goes under the Name of *Athanasius*; but which could not possibly have been written by him, because he, as well as the rest of the *Nicene Fathers*, insisted upon it, that there was but [8] *one Hypostasis* in the Trinity, any more than one *Usia*, since they, contrary to the Doctrine of the *Platonists*, supposed those two Words to mean one and the same thing; in which however they were certainly so far in the right. For the Word *Οὐσία* literally signifies a *Being* or *Existence*; and the Word *ὑπόστασις* literally signifies a *Subsistence*, or *Substance*; which hath been shewed in the [9] Beginning of this Treatise,

[8] *Athanasius*, in his Treatise on the Synods of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*, [vol. i. p. 934.] which was written towards the latter End of his Life, positively asserts: *Ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαίνονμενον ἔχει. Hypostasis enim [idem cum USIA] substantia est, nec aliam significationem habet.* And to the same Purpose in several other Places.

[9] See Sect. ii.

to be the same with a *Being* or *Existence*. And accordingly; the *Greek* Word Οὐσία is generally translated by the *Latin* Word *Substantia*. [1] *Socrates*, the Ecclesiastical Historian, who lived after *Cyril*, and was a very zealous *Consubstantialist*, when giving his Opinion concerning the Meaning of the Word ὑπόστασις, says, “ that this Word, according to “ *Irenæus*, was a barbarous Word; and was “ not to be found among the antient Authors. “ But, says *Socrates*, it is used by *Sophocles*, “ to signify a *Trap* or *Pit-fall*, to catch any “ thing in; and by *Menander* to signify the “ Sediment of any thing; as for Example, “ if any one should call the *Lees* of Wine “ which fall to the Bottom, an *Hypostasis*. “ But though this Word was not used by “ the more ancient Philosophers, yet, says “ he, you must understand that the Mo- “ derns make use of it instead of Οὐσία.” To say therefore that the three Persons in the Trinity are *one* *Ufia* and *three* *Hypostases*, is the same thing as to say, that they are *one* *Substance* and *three* *Substances* at the same time; which I take to be a Contradiction in

[1] *Socrat. Ecclef. Hist. lib. iii. cap. 7.*

Terms, and therefore cannot be affirmed even of God himself.

CXXXIV. For when it is said, in the *Nicene Creed*, that the Son is [2] ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, *of the Substance of the Father*, and that he is ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί, *of one Substance* with the Father, it is not meant thereby that he is of one and the same Kind of Substance with the Father, but that he is actually one and the same *undivided* Substance with the Father. Wherein then, you will say, does the Difference consist? Why according to *Cyril*, not in any natural Diversity, but numerically only; that is, in being said to be three Substances, at the same time that they are but one Substance.

CXXXV. I am very sensible that in our *English Translation* of the Creed commonly called the *Athanasian Creed*, we have followed the Church of *Rome*, whose Infallibility can give what Signification it pleases to Words, in rendering the Word ὑπέρστας, by the *English Word Person*, that Church

[2] This is omitted in our *English Copy* of the *Nicene Creed*, though it was undoubtedly in the original *Greek*.

having

138 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

having rendered it by the *Latin Word Persona*. But let us see whether this will mend the Matter, which we shall find it does not, unless we make use of a shameful kind of Equivocation, by using the Word *Person* in two different Senses, or rather, in no Sense at all. For that the Word *Person* is capable of two different Senses being put upon it is very plain; thus it is sometimes made use of to denote *that identical Personality, whereby any one intelligent Agent is distinguished from any other intelligent Agent*. As for Example, when it is said, *Numb. v. 6, 7.*

“ When a Man or Woman shall commit any
 “ Sin that Men commit, to do a Trespas
 “ against the Lord, and that *Person* be
 “ guilty; then they shall confess their Sin
 “ which they have done,” &c. In this Place the Word *Person* is here put to denote the Man or Woman who was guilty of the Trespas: And can never signify any other Man or Woman but the offending one only; nor any more Persons than those that were guilty. According to which Sense of the Word, every separate Person must be considered as a separate intelligent Agent, and every separate intelligent Agent must be considered as a separate Person from every other

ther

ther intelligent Agent, and will for ever, if he exists so long, be the same Person he was, whether he repents or not, whether he is young or old; or whether he exists in this World or in the next. And it would be a Contradiction in Terms to say, that this one Person is two different Persons, or that two different Persons is the same Person; for hence it is that the common Expression takes its Rise, when speaking of any one Man, we say, this is the very *individual* Person, who did such or such a Fact, because, if he could be *divided*, he would be no longer the same Person.

CXXXVI. But in this Sense of the Word, the *Consubstantialists* will not allow the Word *Person* to be applied to the three Persons in the Trinity, because this would make them as much three separate Beings, as *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*, are three separate Men: And would contradict the *Homousian* Doctrine, which supposes the three Persons of the Trinity to be one *undivided Substance*, or, as *Cyril* expresseth it, *one specific Nature*, or *Essence*.

CXXXVII.

CXXXVII. Sometimes however this Word *Person* is made use of to denote only the Relation which one intelligent Agent bears to another ; or the distinguishing Mark of his Character, whereby he is to be known from other intelligent Agents, or even from himself, either at different Times, or in different Circumstances. In which Sense of the Word the same individual Person, or intelligent Agent, may be considered as twenty different Persons all at the same Time. For thus the same intelligent Agent may be considered in the Person of a King, of a General, of an Ally, of a Philosopher, of a Father, or of a Son, of an Husband, or of a Batchelor, of an old Man, or of a young Man, &c. &c. For, says *Stephens*, in his *Latin Thesaurus*, *Persona significat qualitatem eam, qua homo differt ab homine, tum in anima, tum in corpore, tum in extraposis ; quæ a Rhetoricis annumerantur in Attributis Personæ : ut Hector ad Priamum Persona Filii est ; ad Astyanactem Persona Patris ; ad Andromachem Persona Mariti ; ad Paridem Persona Fratris ; ad Sarpedonem Amici ; ad Achillem Persona Inimici*. In which Sense of the Word it is that that Expression must be understood, when *Moses* saith of God, that

that he [3] *regardeth not Persons*, by which is meant, not that God regardeth not Mankind, as they are so many intelligent Agents, but that he doth not respect Men on account of their personal Circumstances, or Characters, or Figure, or Relation in Life: But neither will the *Consubstantialists* allow this Interpretation of the Word *Person* to be applied to the three Persons in the Trinity; so as to be understood as if they were only three different Personages or Characters, or Attributes, of the same Being; because that would be manifest *Sabellianism*, and would not allow any real Existence to any of them but one.

CXXXVIII. And though they say that one of these Persons is the *Father*, and the other the *Son*; they will not allow one to be prior or posterior to the other; but declare them both to be coequal and coeternal, which is by no means consistent with the Relation that there is between Father and Son: For though the Relation between two coequal coeternal Beings might bear some Analogy to the Denomination of *Brothers*, yet it seems

[3] Deut. x. 17. Matth. xxii. 16. Mark xii. 14.

absolutely

absolutely inconsistent with that of Father and Son.

CXXXIX. But, in order to conduct us a little further into the Knowledge of this Affair, it may be proper to inquire into the Reasons which seem to have led the Compilers of the *Nicene* Creed into this Determination of the Consubstantiality of the Father and Son.

CXL. The Doctrine of *Arius*, was, that *the Son, being begotten of the Father before all Times and all Ages, subsisted only through the Will of the Father : But that he was not eternal, that is coeternal with the Father ; nor did he come into Existence along with the Father.*

CXLI. In order to refute which Doctrine, the *Nicene* Bishops composed a Creed, wherein they asserted the Son to be *of the Substance of the Father, and consubstantial with the Father ;* and at the End of the Creed annexed these three Anathemas, or damnatory Clauses: [4] τὰς δὲ λέγοντας ὅτι ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε ἐκ

[4] Socrat. *Eccles. Hist.* lib. i. cap. 8.

ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι ἐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ ἐκ ὧν
 ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκονταί
 εἶναι, ἢ κλισίον, ἢ τρεπλόν, ἢ αλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ
 Θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ αἰγία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ
 ἐκκλησία. *But they who say, There was a
 Time when the Son was not, and that he did
 not exist before he was begotten: Or that say
 he was begotten out of nothing: Or that say
 he existed out of any other HYPOSTASIS, or
 USIA, than the Father; or was created, or is
 liable to Mutation or Change, the Holy Ca-
 tholic Apostolic Church anathematizes.*

CXLII. From whence it may be observ-
 ed in the first Place, that these Fathers un-
 derstood the Words *Usia* and *Hypostasis* in
 the same Sense, so as to mean one and the
 same thing; and that as the Son was of the
 same undivided, or individual *Usia*, so was
 he also in the same undivided or individual
Hypostasis with the Father. And possibly
 this may be the Reason why these Anathe-
 mas are omitted out of our present *Nicene*
Creed; because they contradict in Terms
 the *Athanasian Creed*, which asserts, that
 “ there is one *Hypostasis* of the Father, and
 “ another of the Son, and another of the
 “ Holy Spirit.”

CXLIII.

CXLIII. But it does not seem so easy to explain what is meant by the first Anathema: *Cursed be they who say, There was a Time when the Son was not; and that he did not exist before he was begotten.* However, if it means any thing, it must be this; that whereas the *Arians* asserted that the Son was begotten before all Time, and before all Ages, nevertheless they asserted, that although they would allow he might, upon that account in some Sense be called eternal; yet that the Son could not be coeternal with the Father, because the Begetter must have existed before the Begotten. In order therefore to invalidate the Force of this Argument, and make the Son nevertheless coeternal with the Father, the *Nicene* Bishops, since they could not deny but the Begetter must have existed before the Begotten, seemed to have framed this Anathema, wherein they assert, in Imitation of *Irenæus*, and some few other metaphysical Writers, that the Son did exist before he was begotten: That is, that he did potentially exist in the Substance of the Father, out of which he was afterwards begotten.

CXLIV. And this is the Reason why they likewise anathematized, in the second Place, those who should say, that the Son was *begotten out of nothing*, in order to establish the following Doctrine of the Son being begotten out of the Substance of the Father; which Substance being undoubtedly coeternal with the Father, therefore the Son, who virtually [5] or potentially existed in it, must, according to their Method of Reasoning, also be coeternal.

CXLV. But, with humble Submission to such great Authority, this Assertion absolutely destroys the modern favourite Doctrine of the eternal Generation of the Son: Because that although it should be allowed that the Son might possibly have virtually subsisted from all Eternity, in the Substance, or Mind, of the Father, as every thing did, that either hath existed, or ever will exist, yet I suppose it a Contradiction in Terms to say, that he existed, as a Son, till he was begotten. And therefore that the *Nicene* Fathers have

[5] Δυνάμει ἢ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἀγενήτως, *Potentia erat in Patre, ingenita quadam ratione.* Theod. Eccles. Hist. lib. i. cap. 12.

anathematized all such as will not affirm a [6] Contradiction.

CXLVI. And I cannot help saying, it is something odd to have these two Creeds established in the same Church, in one of which those are declared to be *accursed*, who deny the Son to be of the same *Usia*, or *Hypostasis*, with the Father; and in the other, it is declared, *they cannot be saved* who do not assert, that [7] *there is one Hypostasis of the Father, and another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost*.

CXLVII. But, in order to obviate all these Objections, it is thought sufficient by some, to say, that there are many Powers in the divine Nature, which human Beings are not capable of comprehending. Nay, so far are we Mortals from being able to comprehend the Divine Nature, that we know very little of the Things which are on Earth; that there is not one of all the various Things which surround us, that does not contain something in its Frame and Constitution, which is be-

[6] For the Assertions of the *Arians* were ἡν πρὸς, ὅτε ὁ υἱὸς ἐκ ἡν, &c. That *there was* (a Time) *when THE SON was not*, &c. Athan. vol. i. p. 97.

[7] *Athanasian Creed*.

yond the Abilities of the most subtile Philosopher to explain.

CXLVIII. Be it so. — Let us then acknowledge the narrow Limits of the human Understanding; which, I think, nobody, who looks within himself, can be without sensibly seeing and feeling: But then let us not turn such violent Sceptics, as to assert, that, because we do not know every thing, therefore we know nothing; that because we cannot see by Night as well as by Day, therefore we must not believe our own Eyes, even when the Sun shines directly over our Heads.

CXLIX. I shall therefore take it for granted, that there are some Truths in Nature, that are level to our Understandings, and that we may pronounce with some Degree of Certainty, for Example, that two and two make four; and that it is a Contradiction in Terms to say, that the same individual Substance, whether spiritual or corporeal, *can be*, and *not be*, at the same Time, and in the same Place. Now, if the Knowledge of these Propositions is within the Reach of our Understanding, then we may safely affirm, if the Father and Son are *consubstantial*, that

148 AN ESSAY ON SPIRIT.

is, if the Substance of the Father be the same undivided Substance with the Son ; and that the Substance of the Son did enter into the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*, and became incarnate ; that then it will follow, of Consequence, that the Substance of the Father did enter into the Virgin's Womb, and was incarnate also. Since otherwise, one and the same individual Substance may be, and not be, at the same Time, and in the same Place.

CL. Again, if this Proposition be taken for granted, which may be found *totidem Verbis*, in the *Athanasian Creed*, that *as the reasonable Soul and Flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ* ; and if this other Proposition be allowed, which may be found as explicitly in the Scriptures, that this one [8] *Christ suffered* for the Sins of Mankind ; then it must follow, of Consequence, that *Christ* suffered in his Godhead, as well as his Humanity ; since otherwise, it would have been the Man *Jesus*, and not *Jesus the Messiah*, or *Christ*, that suffered for the Sins of Men.

[8] Heb. ix. 28. 1 Pet. ii. 21. iii. 18.

CLI. Now as the Consideration of these Things is, so far at least, within the Reach of our Capacities, if we suppose the Premises aforementioned to be true, which the *Consubstantialists* will hardly deny; the Conclusions, which they will not allow, are, nevertheless, as demonstrably true, as any Proposition in the Mathematics.

CLII. But let us go a little further, and suppose, for the present, that these Things were above our Comprehension; and then I should be glad to be informed of the Reasons why those very Persons who roar so loud against the vain Attempts of Men, in scrutinizing *the Things which belong unto Heaven*, should take upon them to explain those Doctrines, which they themselves declare to be above the Reach of human Understandings.

CLIII. When the *Papists* want to persuade Men out of their Senses, and to prevail upon *Protestants* to acknowledge the absurd Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, they are very ample and florid in their Declamations upon the Immensity and Incomprehensibleness of God and his Attributes; and upon the Mi-
nuteness

nuteness and Insufficiency of human Abilities ; and are always setting forth, in the strongest Terms, how little we know, and how much we are ignorant. And therefore, say they, since our Saviour hath said, *This is my Body, and this is my Blood*, we ought to believe it to be so, though we could not comprehend the Manner how.

CLIV. All which would be undoubtedly right, and true, if they were to go no further. But if what they say be true, about the Weakness of human Understandings, how came they to have Abilities for explaining those Mysteries, which the rest of Mankind are so unequal to the Inquiry into? Why do they pretend to say, that this Mystery consists in a *Transubstantiation* of the Elements, when there is no such Word in the Scriptures ?

CLV. And since it must be undoubtedly acknowledged, that the Belief in any Mystery can be no further required as necessary to Salvation, than in proportion as that Mystery is revealed ; if this be a Mystery, surely they ought to leave it as they found it, and not presume to explain that which they declare to be inexplicable.

CLVI.

CLVI. And is not this Method of Reasoning as strong, with regard to *Consubstantiation*, as *Transubstantiation*? It certainly is. And therefore when the *Protestants* argue against the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, the *Papists* never fail objecting the equal Incredibility of a *consubstantial* Trinity.

It certainly is not. We do not s
the Bread
God. - -

CLVII. The Doctrine of the Trinity is as certainly revealed in the 19th Verse of the xxviiiith Chapter of St. *Matthew*, as the Doctrine of the *Eucharist* is, in the 26th Verse of the xxvith Chapter of the same Evangelist: But the Scriptures are as silent about the *Consubstantiality* of the one, as about the *Transubstantiation* of the other. Whence then came the Revelation of these wonderful Doctrines? Why! both originally from the same Oracle; from the Papal Chair.

CLVIII. I think it therefore incumbent on those *Protestant* Bishops, who hold the Doctrine of a consubstantial Trinity, to inform us of the Reasons why the Infallibility of the Pope must be acknowledged in one of these Instances, and not in the other. And why, if their Eyes are sufficient to let them see, as well as the Pope, that the three Persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are

one coeternal, coequal, and undivided Substance, when we undertake to argue against it, they should say to us, Ye are blind! ye are blind! Or, why if we are blind, though they are not, this metaphysical dispute should be made a Part of the public Service of the Church, which is an Assembly composed, not only of quick-sighted Philosophers, but of the lowest of the People, who are required there to give their Assent to these equivocal, if not contradictory, Interpretations of Scripture, under the Penalty of eternal Damnation; and to declare, that *every one who doth not keep this Faith whole and undefiled, without doubt shall perish everlastingly; and that this is the Catholic Faith, which except a Man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.*

CLIX. I shall accordingly expect some of the Right Reverend Members of the *Protestant Church of Ireland*, either to account for this, or to exonerate their Consciences, by joining in an humble Remonstrance against it: And I do promise, if any of them shall deign to honour this *Treatise* with an Answer, that if it pleaseth God to spare my Life, it shall speedily be followed, either by a Recantation, or a Reply.

F I N I S.

A
FULL ANSWER
TO THE
ESSAY on SPIRIT;

WHEREIN

ALL the Author's Objections, both *scriptural* and *philosophical*, to the Doctrine of the TRINITY; his Opinions relating to the *Uniformity* of the CHURCH; his Criticisms upon the *Athanasian* and *Nicene* CREEDS, &c. are examined and confuted.

WITH

A particular EXPLANATION of the *Hermetic*, *Pythagorean*, and *Platonic* TRINITIES:

AND

A PREFACE, giving some account of an Author who has lately published in *Defence* of the *Essay*.

Rev. Wm. Jones

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls: but they said, we will not walk therein. Jerem. vi. 16.

Θεου Σεΐτου λεΐσαι, και εκ αληθινου. *Epiphan. Ancorat.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for E. WITHERS at the *Seven Stars*, next the *Inner Temple-Gate* in *Fleet-street*; and S. PARKER at *Oxford*. M.DCC.LIII.

FULL ANSWER

TO THE

QUESTIONS

PROPOSED

IN THE

DEBATE

ON

THE

QUESTIONS

PROPOSED

IN THE

DEBATE

ON

THE

QUESTIONS

PROPOSED

IN THE

DEBATE

ON

THE

QUESTIONS

PROPOSED

IN THE

DEBATE

ON

To the REVEREND

Sir *John Dolben*, Bart. D. D.

A N D

Prebendary of *DURHAM*.

Reverend Sir !

AS my situation renders me, in some measure, accountable to you for the use I make of my leisure hours, it is natural for me to seek your favour and protection with regard to the following papers ; your kind acceptance of which, will not be imputed to any merit of theirs, but entirely to that well-conducted zeal and unreserved condescension, which will not suffer you to despise even the meanest efforts, where they are intended to promote the honour of God, or the welfare of mankind.

But I have many other reasons, Sir, for prefixing your name to the following pages ; from which, the motive already-mentioned borrowed its chief and more especial influence : for I am fully sensible, that your character and station in the Church, your firm attachment to, and experienced knowledge of, the Holy Scriptures, your familiar acquaintance with Antiquity, both sacred and profane, and your unblemished life (the best recommendation of every other excellence) will reconcile my readers, be they more or less, to whatever you shall be pleased in any degree to approve ; and effectually remove those natural prejudices, which otherways might be conceived, as well against my years, as against the name of a person so unknown to the world.

I ought indeed to make some apology for presenting a piece of the controversial sort, to one who esteems it a far greater benefit to *believe*,
 than

than an entertainment to *dispute* ; and whose temper is too serene and harmonized to have much relish for the noise and discord of a controversy : but the importance and dignity of that divine truth, which I have humbly endeavoured to assert and vindicate, as it will justify me to the world, so will it likewise recommend me to your attention ; be the form of my work either smooth and declamatory, or, as at present it is obliged to be, rugged and disputatious.

I am so far, Sir, from taking any pleasure in thrusting myself into a public controversy, (and indeed my talents are rather fitted for retirement and obscurity) that it would give me a much greater satisfaction to behold them that *confess God's holy name, agreeing in the truth of his holy word*, than to be capable of writing the most learned refutation of one that opposes or contradicts it : to see the church of *Christ* in possession

possession of that peace, which he himself bequeathed to it, than to obtain the most compleat victory over one of its adversaries.

But so many unreasonable demands, Sir, are made upon us, some of them even by men of our own order, that our state is, and must be, militant. Peace, under these circumstances, is not to be obtained, but by making the most unlimited concessions, and bringing the christian faith down to their size, whom we cannot persuade to come up to it.

A treaty of coalition, proposed upon such terms as these, will, I trust in God, never be submitted to by the legislative powers of this realm: I believe, and am persuaded, that it will not: and those writers, who solicit them to the repealing of any article, supported by the undoubted warrant of divine writ, pay so mean a compliment to their understanding, as well as to
 3 their

their Faith, that they will, I dare say, reject it with a just and suitable indignation.

As for the manner in which I have treated the subjects that have occurred to me, I forbear to say any thing either by way of excuse or recommendation; taking it for granted, Sir, that as your learning and judgment, on the one hand, are not to be bribed by the tedious apologies of a petitionary writer; so your unaffected candour and humanity, on the other, will naturally dispose you to make every just and favourable allowance. And though I am not so presuming as to expect, that what I have now offered should be found sufficient to remove every objection, and clear every difficulty; yet I am encouraged to hope, it will at least be accepted (by you, Sir, I am sure it will) as the sincere testimony of one, who aspires to no higher character, than that of an humble Claimant in behalf of our religion,

religion, and an hearty well-wisher
to our constitution; and who gladly
takes this opportunity of professing
himself to be, with the most un-
feigned respect and veneration,

REVEREND SIR,

Your most obliged,

Most obedient,

And very faithful Servant,

Finedon,
March 25, 1753.

WILLIAM JONES.

P R E F A C E.

IT was not my intention to trouble or detain the reader with a preface ; but some time after the following sheets were ready for the press, a pamphlet came forth with this title— *A defence of the Essay on Spirit ; with remarks on the several pretended Answers ; and which may serve as an antidote against all that shall ever appear against it.*—If the book itself should really be able to support such a Title-page, and be found answerable to the latter part of it, my labour can avail but little. I think, however, that I may be pretty secure of its making any impression to my disadvantage, as the author of it, in the first place, does not seem rightly to understand the very scope and design of the piece he has undertaken to *defend*.

He tells us, that the author of the *Essay's* “ *whole* book seems *only* intended, not to enforce any explanations of his own, but to shew how ineffectual all attempts to explain this mystery (the doctrine of the Trinity) have been hitherto.”^a Now, if he has enforced *no*

b

expla-

^a Defence, p. 5.

explanations of his own, then it would be impossible for me to extract and produce them: but the substance of them, in short, is as follows:—The person of the *Father* only, is the *one supreme intelligent Agent*: the *Son*, and *Holy Spirit* are not really God, but *called so*, because, by an authority communicated to them from the Supreme, they are commissioned to ACT AS GODS with regard to those inferior beings committed to their charge.^b—And so far is the *Essay*-writer from endeavouring to exclude *every* explanation, that his whole book is principally calculated for the support of *this*.

Let it also be considered, that in the *dedication* prefixed to his *Essay*, he hopes that “his
“ sentiments will by gentle degrees come, by
“ the blessing of God, to be made a part of
“ the established religion of the country.”^c If therefore, as it is asserted in the *Defence*, he has enforced *no* explanation of the Trinity; and it is nevertheless hoped in the *Essay*, that *his sentiments* will be made a part of the established religion; this is in effect to hope, that *Nothing* (by the blessing of God) will be established as a fundamental of the christian faith. So that this Gentleman, instead of *defending* the *Essay*, seems to have defeated its principal intention, misrepresented its author, and reduced his whole book to an absurdity.

Another

^b See chap. V. of the following *Answer*.

^c P. 51.

Another method of this writer, almost as hurtful to the cause he has undertaken as the former, is to assert what he cannot possibly know to be true, even supposing it were so, and what the world must know to be false. A justly celebrated discourse upon the Trinity, written by the late dean *Swift*, has, upon the publication of the *Essay*, and to prevent in some measure (as the *Editor* expresses himself) the evil effects of that treatise, been reprinted in *Ireland*. This discourse, the author now before us has assaulted with a great degree of prejudice and animosity; and after he has sifted some absurd and contradictory senses out of its expressions, and treated his lordship of *Orrery*, and other *able* and *learned* gentlemen, with great contempt for not having *skill enough* to make the same discovery, confidently affirms, that he has “ shewn the *Dean* to “ have been *an Arian* in his heart.”^d Now, if the *Dean* has been so unhappy in his expressions, as to subscribe himself *an Arian*, while he meant to declare himself *a Catholic*, he must surely have wanted common sense, a defect, which (in his day) he was farther from than most men living: if in his expressions he appears to be *orthodox*, and yet was, in the *secrets of his heart*, an *Arian*; this author must pretend to some degree of omniscience in being able to find it out.

As a specimen of his comments upon the Holy Scripture, I may set down the evidence he has alledged in favour of angel-worship.

The *Arians* have always been greatly distressed to justify the adoration they allow to the second and third persons of the Blessed Trinity, while at the same time they degrade them down to the rank of created beings. It is therefore presumed in the *Essay*, that the worship of angels can be no idolatry, because it *terminates in the one only and true God*: to which a certain author has very judiciously replied—"yet it seems, in " *St. Paul's* style, being idolatrous, and *doing* " (religious) *service to them which by nature are* " *no Gods*, are synonymous expressions." But here, the author of the *Defence*, in order to avoid the conflict in which he seems apprehensive of a defeat, "cannot but lament the ill treatment the " scriptures of truth meet with, when they light " into indiscreet hands, who catch at a single " verse, which without considering *the context*, " they *wrest* to their own purposes: for in those " words of *St. Paul*, the crime is, *serving them* " *which are not Gods by nature*, without a commission from God for so doing; by which " means, the service did not terminate in the " one only and true God."^e

That

^e Of an article published in the *Dublin Literary Journal* for December 1751.

^f Page 13.

That there are, in the world, men *unlearned* and *unstable*, who bend and accommodate the scriptures to serve some private purpose of their own, is a lamentable truth, which every serious Inquirer will be ready enough to confess; and the reader, I am sure, will agree with me, that the remark I have just now transcribed, is likely to afford us a most ample confirmation of it: for after this pathetic exclamation against ill treatment, indiscreet hands, and a disregard to the context, the verse itself contains an argument full and clear, and the disregarded context—*without a commission from God for so doing*—which gives a contrary turn, or, a *wrest* to the whole, is not St. Paul's, but *his own*.

If the crime of the Heathens in worshipping their idols, consisted (according to this author's state of the case) only in a want of commission; then he must suppose it possible, for God to authorize that very crime, against which he hath pronounced the most extreme vengeance and malediction, the very *abomination that he hateth*,^s for the adoration of the creature, to redound to the glory of the Creator; and for the worship of an idol, the stump of a tree, to *terminate in the only and true God*.

I will in this place take the liberty of propounding the following short remark: that as it
appears

^s Deut. xii. 31. See chap. xxviii. 14, &c.

appears from the text of St. *Paul* above-cited, we are to worship those only who are (ΦΥΣΕΙ ΘΕΟΥ) *Gods by nature* ; and as all the primitive ecclesiastical writers, in their application of the term οὐσία, *essence*, make it synonymous with Φύσις, *nature*,^h it may, I humbly conceive, be inferred from hence, that the *Homoousian* doctrine, for the sake of which the *Arians* would reject both the *Athanasian* and *Nicene* creeds, is scriptural in its *term*, as well as in its *sense*. For, if we are to worship the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, as the *Arians* themselves are forced to confess, they must be *God by NATURE*, ομοουσιοι, *of the same essence or nature* with God the Father ; if not, the adoration we pay to them must include us in that sentence of condemnation passed upon the idolatrous Gentiles. But to return to the author, whose manner of reasoning I shall, in the next place, take some notice of.

Dean *Swift* tells us in his Sermon, that “ about three hundred years after Christ, there sprang up an heresy, of people called *Arians* from one *Arius* the leader of them : these (says he) denied our Saviour to be God ;” where the author immediately replies — “ than which nothing can be more false ; for they did acknowledge him to be God.”ⁱ

Here

^h Ἰστέον, ὅτι ὅσα καὶ φύσις ταύτου ἐστὶ παρὰ τοῖς πατέρας. Notandum est, *essentiam* & *naturam* idem esse apud Patres. Leont. de Sect. p. 308.

ⁱ Page 22.

Here the reader should be informed, that this Gentleman has *two* definitions of a God : by the first, there is a *supreme* and *true* God ; by the second, a subordinate and nominal God, who only *acts* as such, of which sort he says there may be *three hundred*.^k Tell him, that the *Arians* denied our Saviour to be God, and he can boldly renounce the charge : but then, it is with a secret view to the *second* definition, when the charge plainly proceeds against them only with a respect to the *first*, and when the first alone can have either sense or truth in it.

Where he cannot disprove any thing, he puzzles and perplexes the whole cause, and by interweaving a proportionable quantity of falshood, renders a question, in every view of it, unintelligible ; and so far he is certainly in the right ; for error is not to be advanced either by truth or perspicuity. In pursuance of this plan, he confounds the *Consubstantialists* (that is, the *catholic Christians*) with the *Sabellians*, and *vice versa* the *Sabellians* with the *Consubstantialists*, in the following manner—" The *Consubstantialists* and the "*Sabellians* (says he) agree *exactly* in their "*opinion of the indivisible unity of the substance of God between the three Persons of the "*Trinity."^l Which is impossible to be true : For if the *Sabellians* agreed *exactly* in this matter with

^k Page 44.

^l Page 27, 28.

with the *Catholics*, they must then have maintained that there *were* three Persons in the Trinity, between whom this indivisible union might subsist: but on the contrary, they affirmed the whole Godhead to be *μικρὸν ὑποστάσις*, or *μονοπροσωπός*,^m *only ONE hypostasis or Person*.

Again: “When the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,” says he, “are declared by the *Athanasians* to be the same one undivided Person in reality; I own I do not see any difference between that and the doctrine of *Sabellius*.”ⁿ First, he makes the *Sabellians* assert *three* Persons in the Godhead, who never allowed more than *one*; then, makes the *Athanasians* allow but *one* Person, who always asserted *three*; and then solemnly declares—that he sees no difference between their doctrines! Let me desire this Gentleman, for God’s sake, to reflect a while on the notorious falsities advanced in his book, of which I could produce *many* more instances. If he should condescend to do this, at my earnest request, I would then recommend to him a comparison between *Rev.* ii. 2. and xxi. 8. being willing to hope, that those texts, when laid together and considered, may have such a profitable influence upon his heart, as to induce him to alter his style, and favour us with a piece rather more chastised and correct, if ever he should appear again in the capacity of an author.

^m See *Epiphanius*. v. 2. p. 513.

ⁿ Page 42, 43.

I cannot observe in a more proper place, that he threatens the world with a treatise, whence it will “ appear, that that part of our Ecclesiastical History, which relates to the dispute between the *Arians* and *Athanasians*, is little better than an heap of falsities and forgeries.” °. For I apprehend that the forgeries above-mentioned may enable the reader to conceive, not an unjust idea, of an *Arian* turned *Historian*: If these are not sufficient, let him attentively peruse the author’s whole book; and if that will not do, let me beseech him to consider that account the most excellent and learned bishop *Bull* has given of *Christoph. Sandius’s Nucleus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ—copiosissimâ fabularum & contradictionum accessione locupletatus*—^p and I am persuaded he will then be upon his guard against every historical tract which comes from *that* quarter.

I shall now remark (and in truth I am almost tired of remarking) his rashness in censuring what, it is plain, he has not properly considered. The celebrated and learned Dr. *Stebbing*, in a quotation this author has made from him, says, “ How three, as distinct in point of *agency*, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, should by one common principle of existence, be one eternal God; this exceeds the measure of our finite
“ under

° Page 40. ^p Def. Fid. Nic. Procem. §. 6. See also Pages 69, 121, 229, & *alibi sparsim*.—The *Irenicum Irenicorum* is another history of the same complexion with *Sandius*.

“ understandings to comprehend : yet it is not
 “ therefore a contradiction ; yet it is not there-
 “ fore incredible.” Which observation, though
 common, is yet very pious, well expressed, and
 worthy of the Gentleman that made it. But,
 says our author, “ If the Doctor had but inserted
 “ any one noun-substantive after the adjective
 “ *three*, which he, as all the *Atbanasians* care-
 “ fully do, has *disingenuously* omitted, and with-
 “ out which the whole sentence is *nonsense**, he
 “ could not have avoided seeing the contradic-
 “ tion, as well as pointing it out to others¹.”
 The noun-substantive inserted by the church upon
 this occasion, is the word *Persons* : and the most
 free and dispassionate enquirer can perceive no
 contradiction in saying, that the blessed Trinity
 are three *Persons*, and one *God* ; three and one,
 in different respects ; three, in respect of their
personality, and one in respect of their *divine na-*
ture, or, as Dr. *Stebbing* has worded it, their
common principle of existence. To say, either that
 they are three *Persons* and one *Person*, or, three
Gods and one *God*, would be to suppose them
 three and one, in one and the same respect, and
 would indeed amount to a contradiction in terms ;
 which is the very thing this author has made of
 it : “ for, adds he, “ every one, who is not *out*
 “ of his senses, must see, that affirming *three*
 “ *eternal*

* He elsewhere says of this expression, that it is — non-
 sense artfully cloathing itself, that it may look something like
 sense.

¹ P. 34, 35.

“ *eternal Gods* to be *one eternal God*, is a contradiction^r.” Very true : and I hope no man that is *in his senses*, when writing upon such a subject as this, would dare to *make* a contradiction, where he did not find one. But I must press this point a little farther : for it is observable, that the very same omission of the noun-substantive, and where the very same sense is expressed too, occurs in the *inspired writings* : Οἱ οἱ ΤΡΕΙΣ, ΕΝ αὐτοῖς, *These THREE are ONE* — so that this bold accusation of *disingenuity*, *nonsense*, and something worse, alledged at first against Dr. *Stebbing*, will, when carried forwards, be at last fixed upon Him — whose name I dare not mention upon such occasion.

In order to give a proper account of the *antidote*, and enable the reader, as well as I can, to comprehend the force and propriety of it, it will be requisite to premise a few of the author’s principles, as they are to be collected from that part of his book, which precedes what is called in the Title-page—*An antidote against all that shall ever appear against the Essay on Spirit*.

The author of the *Defence* then, declares against all the *decrees of councils* and *doctrines of men*^s; advises *metaphysical divines* to forbear their own *comments*^t; and will suffer nothing but *clear and express revelation*^u to determine him with regard to any article of moment. And yet, in express

c 2

con-

^r P. 34, 35.^s P. 3.^t *Ibid.*^u P. 4, 50, 79.

contradiction to all this, the ingredients of his *antidote*, which is to preclude all future controversies, to determine the question for ever on the *Arian* side, and (as its very name implies) to *expel* the *poison* of orthodoxy, are nothing more than a quotation from *Justin Martyr* ^w, and another from the *Gentleman's Religion* ^x; the former a very obscure *metaphysical comment*, the latter a groundless and unsupported assertion. If we had not ocular demonstration for this, it would seem altogether incredible, that the same author who has rejected all *human comments*, and set at naught *all the councils in Christendom* ^y, should think himself secure under the shelter of that very authority, nay, under a small and insignificant portion of it, the whole of which he has made it his business to vilify and condemn. Had he been more consistent with himself, and proposed his quotation from *Justin Martyr* with the sobriety that might have been expected, I should then have attempted to shew with the same sobriety, that it contains *the indivisible union of the Son with the substance of the Father*; though blended, as I freely confess, with some perplexed and metaphysical reasonings, which indeed are reconcilable to the principles of *Plato*, but not to those of the *Holy Scripture*. However, as he has introduced it in such a manner as to render it repugnant to his own principles, and therefore incapable of doing
his

^w P. 54 to 78.^x 79 to 82.^y P. 29.

his cause the least service (be the doctrine of it this or that) I shall not try to give the reader any edification or amusement by a critical discussion of a very long passage, unlikely to afford either.

But I must not throw his book aside, without giving some short account of his language ; I mean, of his candour, humility, and charity ; which virtues are as much disregarded in the *Defence* (if that be possible) as they are recommended in the *Essay*.

The gentlemen who have advised the Reverend author of the *Essay* to resign his preferment ; that is, in effect, to appease his conscience, retract his subscription, and cease to disturb the peace of the church with his own private scruples ; he upbraids with a *spirit of persecution and ignorance*^z : which is not more unkind than it is untrue and injudicious. For, on the contrary, those restless and discontented men, that have esteemed the doctrines and authority of the church to be an intolerable burden, and undertaken to supplant its truth by a surreptitious introduction of their own errors, (whatever specious appearances of candour and moderation they might at first assume in *proposing* them) have in fact, when affairs have taken an unhappy turn, themselves proved the most lawless persecutors and merciless oppressors of all *civil* and *religious* liberty^a.

And

^z P. 52.

^a See the short extract made in the following pages from Mr. *Echard's* Hist. of *England*.

And I leave it to be considered, whether the spirit that has discovered itself in the *Defence*, were it permitted to have its full play, might not bid fair for an imitation of them. Besides, how inconsistent is it, first to tell us that our doctrines and subscriptions are such as must *drive all men of sense and honesty* (such as the author is) *out of the church* ^b; and then, when we ground a slight admonition upon his own principle, to turn short upon us with the stale pretences of *popery! persecution! St. Dominic! Bishop Bonner! fire! fagot, &c* ^c!

Dean Swift he calls a *Goliath* of *Gath*, sent out (by the republication of his sermon in *Ireland*) *to defy the armies of the living God*; and thinks he has *flung a few round pebbles of arguments so directly in his face, as to make him lie prostrate upon the ground* ^d. Which unnatural application of the Scripture-history gives us a taste of his *charity*, and shews, that in his opinion the *Arians* are the elect people of God, the *true Israelites*, whilst all the opposers of their doctrine (which I hope includes every good christian in the nation) are uncircumcised *Philistines*, infidels, idolaters, and in professed rebellion against the living God.

The orthodox Clergy in general, he reviles as a set of cloudy, bigotted, indolent men, who,
if

^b P. 52.

^c *Ibid.*

^d P. 21. and 53.

if they can but preserve their subscriptions and good livings, care not what becomes of Christianity^e; because they have not wrote an answer (or had not at least when his book was published) to the late Lord *Bolingbroke's* objections; and unless he has written one himself, it is unfair to make this a pretence for insulting them.

The learned gentlemen that have appeared in print against the *Essay*, he calls, collectors of cavils^f, orthodox gentry^g, men that neither understand the dispute, nor any thing else^h, their own trumpetersⁱ, minor scribblers^k, animals^l, buzzing insects^m, hard headsⁿ, &c. &c. charges the grave and learned Dr. *Stebbing* with wilful nonsense, the whole church with blasphemy^o: then wipes his mouth, and desires that if any body should undertake to answer the *Essay on Spirit*, they will do it with — *Christian candour and moderation*^p!

From this view of things, we cannot but conceive a proper opinion both of the talents and the spirit of this author; whom, in truth, it has given me much less pleasure to expose, than concern that there was occasion for it. And now, if this *Defence* was written by the author of the *Essay*, what an amazing change of character is here! In the *Essay* it is — *Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*^q. — That principle which directs

^e P. 52, 53.

^h P. 15.

^m P. 51.

^p P. 52.

^f P. 2.

ⁱ 17.

ⁿ 52.

^q Ded. p. 35.

^g P. 19. and 53.

^k P. 51.

^o P. 10, 44.

^l 52.

directs us to use all men well, can never vindicate us in using any man ill ¹. — And again — were it not that experience convinces us of the matter of fact, it would be HARD TO BELIEVE that mens passions could carry them to that degree of animosity against each other, on account of opinions BARELY SPECULATIVE (such as the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity is supposed to be, and upon which the dispute has turned in the Defence) which we find practised in all countries, and almost in all ages. There the ruling principle is an universal love and affection, that makes charitable allowances for every sect of men in the world ; extending even to Hereticks, Infidels, Jews and Mahometans ; and lavishly dispensing, as from the papal chair, its indulgences to every error under heaven. But here (in the Defence) a very different passion is predominant ; so far from making allowances in favour of error, that it cannot bear even the least degree of opposition from the sincere advocates of the truth ; but vents itself in wilful forgeries, contempt, calumny, and all the overflowings of an enraged malevolence. Whether the *Essay* and the *Defence* therefore came both from the same hand (though it is suspected they did) I shall not take upon me to determine ; since it is almost impossible to believe, that these different passions, so diametrically opposite to each other, can ever reside in the same breast.

But

¹ Ded. p. 35.

² *Ibid.* p. 35.

But since it plainly appears, that authors of the *Arian* persuasion can write (as occasion shall serve) with two very different tempers ; I must beg leave to mention, that if any learned gentleman, who is of their opinion, should think so inconsiderable a writer as I am worth his notice, and fairly propose his objections to any part of the following work with sense and argument, I shall be ready, with God's leave, to give him satisfaction to the best of my abilities, and with seriousness and sobriety. But if any writer should unfortunately fix upon the same plan with the author of this *Defence*, and persuade himself that he can invalidate my arguments by setting me down for an *animal*, a *buzzing insect*, or an *bard bead*, I can easily forgive him, but must be excused from making any reply.

If I myself should unawares have been hurried on by a warm'd imagination to any degree of that extravagance which I have blamed in others, I am ready on the slightest admonition to retract it ; and do heartily assure the ingenuous and *christian* reader, that if, in the course of the succeeding pages, it should appear that any unjust strictures have escaped me, any small attempts at wit or ridicule, which may give the least reasonable offence to him, they shall no longer have any approbation from me.

What I have offered in relation to the *Heathen Trinities* †, I would recommend to the consideration of the learned ; not by way of *instructing* them, I pretend to no such thing, but rather, that they who are better enabled to judge of it than I am, may try how far such a *physical* explanation of the heathen *mythology* will go ; and I desire not that any greater weight should be laid upon it, than by a temperate and regular application it will be found to bear. In my *first chapter*, where I have frequently taken an occasion of referring to the *physics* of the most ancient heathens, I have dropt a short hint of some resemblance between their natural philosophy, and the *physical part* of Sir *Isaac Newton's* works. If the judicious and inquisitive reader should think it worth pursuing, he may perhaps see it abundantly confirmed by comparing the few quotations I have there made from the heathen books (which, had there been occasion, might have been greatly multiplied) with what has lately been advanced by my learned and ingenious friend Mr. *Horne*, Fellow of *Magdalen College* in *Oxford*, entitled—*A fair and impartial State of the Case*, &c. a work, which as far as it has yet had time to circulate, seems to be receiv'd with general approbation.

A
FULL ANSWER
TO THE
ESSAY on SPIRIT.

A N
A N S W E R
T O T H E
E S S A Y on S P I R I T.

THE author of this *essay* addresses his *dedication* to the Lord-primate of *Ireland*, and sets out with telling his Grace, that “ as a clergyman, he
 “ was obliged to subscribe the articles of
 “ our religion, and give his assent to all
 “ things contained in the *Book of Common*
 “ *Prayer* ; but since that time, having
 “ *thought*, as well as *read*, he finds that he
 “ does not now agree *exactly* in sentiment
 “ either with his *former opinions*, or with
 “ those persons who drew up the articles of
 “ our religion, or with the compilers of our
 “ Liturgy, and in particular with the *Atha-*
 “ *nasian Creed* ; and therefore he has la-

B

“ boured

“boured under some difficulties how to direct himself in these circumstances.”

It appears then, that this gentleman, before he subscribed the articles, did *read*, but not *think*; and yet, that what he then thought to be true (for he acknowledges a *former opinion*) he now thinks to be false. Therefore, as he entered upon an ecclesiastical preferment, because he thought the articles true, by thinking otherwise, he hath discharged himself from the obligation of keeping that preferment, whatever it be, any longer in possession. I should suppose then, that he might without much difficulty *direct himself properly* under these circumstances; since nothing hinders him from giving up his preferment, if he so strongly objects to that title, or rather, to those conditions, upon which he holds it. He confesses, that he now differs in opinion from his former-self; from the bishops who drew up our articles in conformity to the word of scripture; from those who in this age are subscribers to the faith; in short, he confesses that the whole establish'd church is against him. Now he cannot surely be so unmerciful to our consciences, as to expect,

I

that

that we shall disregard all these authorities; go contrary to the sense of the church in all ages; and calmly give up our faith and doctrine, in compliance with the opinion of one single person, who, not many years ago, was of a different opinion; and is, I presume, but lately come to his present opinion: which is to suppose, that the truth of Christianity depends upon opinion; and that its very leading article, the doctrine of the Trinity, may be this or that, just as a wavering mind happens to *think*.

That uncertainty in which this author hath involved himself, inclines him to *apprehend any attempt towards avoiding diversity of opinions, not only to be an useless, but also an impracticable scheme*. As long as men will *lean to their own understandings*, in contempt of that divine rule by which they are to be directed, I grant it to be *impracticable*; they will then *believe a lie*, and have *pleasure in their own unrighteous imaginations*. But we must distinguish between *faith* and *opinion*; since no faith can be genuine, but when regulated by the word of God, in which we can find no authority or

indulgence for a man's *thinking* just as he pleases, where God has determined the point for him. Every attempt therefore towards reducing Christian men to an unity of faith, is laudable, pious, and useful ; for there is *one* faith, and *one* Lord, who ceases to be one and the same to *us*, so long as we have different opinions about him. And I cannot but hope that this scheme is in a great measure practicable, since the principal testimony which our Lord requires us to give the world of the truth we hold, is, to *love one another* ; for the effecting of which, an unity of sentiment, touching matters of true religion, is absolutely necessary.

The author is fond of representing an unity of sentiment, as a thing altogether impracticable, substituting (as before) the word *opinion* instead of *faith*, and is in doubt *whether any two thinking men are agreed exactly in their opinions*. Let them who oppose their own conjectural systems to the express word of scripture, let them, I say, look to that : for the observation hath little or no concern with those, who *bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of*

of *Christ*; whose word, like its divine author, is perfect and unchangeable, however *thinking men* may err in their comments upon it.

Thus much for the disagreements of *thinking men*; from whom the *author* makes a transition to what he calls, the *unthinking*, and observes, that *whatever country you go into, let the religion be what it will, the unthinking part are always the reputed orthodox*^c. A truly christian account of the holy catholic church! which, it seems, is compos'd of nothing but men who *think*, but do not *agree*; and men who *agree*, but do not *think*. I would ask this gentleman, from whom the *unthinking herd*^d of this nation derive the faith now established in our creeds and articles? for if they did not also derive it from *another* unthinking herd, nothing suitable to his purpose can be inferred from their orthodoxy. But they derive it, thro' the ministration of the Apostles and their successors, from *Christ*; therefore the *herd*, whether thinking or unthinking, can, as orthodox, be charged with nothing, but what, if carried far enough backwards, will

^c P. 7.

^d Ibid.

will equally hold good against *Christ* and his apostles.

However, we may boldly challenge him to *prove* the *orthodox*, an *unthinking herd*; because the men, who chiefly set themselves forth as orthodox, are those who solemnly subscribe their unfeigned assent to the orthodox faith, I mean, the clergy of the nation; who from the discipline they undergo before they are called upon to give this proof of their orthodoxy, are supposed, at least, to be men of some discernment in matters of christian doctrine and human literature. These then are the *unthinking herd*, thus reflected upon; and, for the author to represent his clerical brethren as a beastly, illiterate rabble, is not quite so handsome. But neither will the subject bear to be inverted; for it is not altogether so clear, that ignorance, and thoughtlessness, will preserve an apparent pretence to orthodoxy among the vulgar; rather the contrary. For most of those sectaries which have rejected orthodoxy, and look upon the glad and humble professors of it, in the light that *Milton* represents the *Devil* to have done upon *Gabriel*,

*briel**, have generally sprung from the root of ignorance; which, when nourished by a proper degree of pride, is always productive of error.

The *Quakers*, for example, arose from the ever memorable *George Fox*, a mean and ignorant mechanick, that could hardly spell his own name; but with bloody invectives against *Baal's priests*, execrable *kierlings*, *devil-driven Judases*, with which, and many more such soft appellations, his lamb-like spirit honoured all the ministers of Christ, was enabled to draw away the unlearned, and unstable, into the very sink of error and delusion. Now, if *to think*, be to substitute heterodoxy, and a lying spirit in the place of sound faith and the spirit of truth, the author may behold *George Fox* and his adherents, claiming the chief seat in the synagogue of *thinkers*; and if he still professes to *think*, in this sense, it may not be an unprofitable mortification to him, to see how much nearer the *thinking herd* approach to brutality, than those whom he

is

* Proud *limitary* cherub! Par. lost. B. 4. 969. Had *Satan* been speaking to one of the orthodox, instead of *limitary*, he would have said, I suppose—*pacing in the tramels of the Church*. See *Middletown's Free Enquiry*.

is pleased to sneer for slavishly embracing the *creed of their fathers*.

He allows, indeed, that an *uniformity of profession may be both practicable and useful; and that it seems in some degree necessary—for the good of society*^f. In this, if I am not so unhappy as to misunderstand him, he levels the christian religion down to a political scheme, calculated for the preservation of peace, or the *outward forms of society*^g, and intended only to make men hang together like a swarm of bees, which at the end of the summer, are to be smoaked out and buried in the earth. But the essential worth of the christian faith, is its great promise not only of this life, but of *that which is to come*. The *good of society*, without any thing farther, must sound very flat and dead in the ears of one, whose *hopes are full of immortality*; and is seldom recommended merely of itself, but by your little philosophical dabblers, who either disbelieve the resurrection, or think themselves no way interested in the expectation of it.

If an *uniformity of profession* be all that is necessary, and if even this be no farther necessary, than for the preservation of peace,
then

^f Ibid.

^g P. 9.

then any national religion, established and agreed upon by compact and consent, would answer the end as well; since the external regulation of society would not, in this case, depend upon the *kind* or *quality* of the *religion*, but upon the *uniformity* with which it is *professed*. What a shocking position is here! however, I believe, it may be matched with another or two, so much resembling it, that though they differ somewhat in expression, yet the sentiments are the same; and these from the celebrated Dr. *Middleton*, who in his spiteful letter to Dr. *Waterland*^h has the following grave remark upon the *immorality* of *Tindal's* scheme. “ Should
 “ he then gain his end, and actually demo-
 “ nish *christianity*, what would be the con-
 “ sequence; what the fruit of his labours,
 “ but confusion and disorder, till some other
 “ *traditional religion* could be settled in its
 “ place; till we had *agreed* to recal either
 “ the *gods* of the *old world*, *Jupiter*, *Mi-*
 “ *nerva*, *Venus*, &c. or with the *idolaters*
 “ *of the new*, to worship *sun*, *moon*, and
 “ *stars*; or instead of *Jesus*, take *Mahomet*
 “ or *Confucius*, for the *author of our faith*?”
 and to the same purpose, *p.* 55. “ but should

C

we

“ we consider it (*christianity*) as the *best of*
 “ *all other religions*, the *best contrived to*
 “ promote *publick peace* and the *good of so-*
 “ *ciety*—then his crime will be aggravated
 “ in proportion—since as is said above, some
 “ *traditional religion* or other must take
 “ place, as necessary to *keep the world in*
 “ *order.*”

I shall dismiss these impious tenets, with
 observing briefly, that a political agreement
 in the idolatrous republics of *Rome* and
Athens, and peace and union under Christ
 in the *household of faith*, are things entirely
 different both in their nature and in their
 consequences; the former being built upon
 spurious and worldly principles, calculated to
 promote a transitory earth-born glory, and
 prevent men from cutting one anothers
 throats; though the principles they went
 upon often made them do it, and were pro-
 ductive, just as it happened, either of or-
 der, peace, and agreement, or of anarchy,
 disorder, and bloodshed. The latter de-
 pends upon an *uniformity of saving faith*,
 revealed in mercy to lost mankind, by the
 righteous judge of all the earth, and sown in
 the hearts of the meek and lowly, enabling
 them

them to bring forth those uniform and genuine fruits of love and charity to their fellow-redeemed, which will entitle them, as a nation, to the protection of God in this life, and at length give them a place amidst the glorious assembly of the first born, in the regions of everlasting bliss and immortality. Such is the difference between his little plea of temporary peace, and an uniform participation of the means of grace in the church of Christ.

But it was his interest to make an *uniformity of belief*, a matter so slight and trivial; or if of any consequence, a scheme quite impracticable, and to recommend instead of it an *uniformity of profession* only, that his readers might be the better prepared to receive his opinion concerning *subscriptions*: for as it is his most explicit purpose flatly to deny the consubstantiality, and co-eternity of the ever blessed Trinity, to which doctrines, as they now stand in our creeds and articles, he hath by a subscription declared his *unfeigned assent*; it must alarm the honest part of his readers, and put them upon enquiring, what method he has found of quieting his conscience? Why, truly, a

very odd one ; for it is his opinion, that *a man, for prudential reasons, may honestly subscribe and submit to the use of one established form, though he in his private opinion may think another to be better*ⁱ; and as for such of his brethren who differ from him, they *consider subscriptions in the same light with the bigotted members of the church of Rome*^k.

But, soft and fair, Sir ; we must not nauseate moral honesty or christian fidelity, because a fanciful person is pleased to stigmatize such parts of it with the name of popery, as really have nothing to do with popery ; or if at all concerned with it, are directly against it. For if we are not *strictly bound* by a subscription to be Christians and Protestants, we may subscribe with our hands, and declare with our lips, and yet in our hearts be very *Papists, Jews, Mahometans*, or what we please.

I must therefore ask, for what purpose any man subscribes to, what the author calls, an *established form*, that is, to the *book of common prayer*, and all the doctrines therein contained, but to satisfy the church that he *believes them* ? otherways his subscription must be attended with an high
degree

degree of contumacy against God and man.

For it hath often been insisted upon, and that with the utmost truth and propriety, that our articles are articles of doctrine, and that kind of *assent* which is given to *christian doctrines*, we call *faith*; and, therefore, when a person declares his *assent* to these doctrines, we must of necessity understand that he *believes* them: if he does not, *quo teneam nodo?* how are we to deal with him, or what are we to think of him?

If such fraudulent prevarications as these are admitted of, how can the state be secure of any man's fidelity, or the king of his allegiance; when the same subtilties which can explain away his ecclesiastical subscription, will prevent the most solemn state oaths from binding him? This is such a direct violation of moral honesty, as well as christian fidelity, that it must give offence to every one that wishes well either to the church or state; for should such loose principles prevail, the most important contracts, nay (I repeat it again) the most solemn oaths, on whatsoever occasion submitted to, may like threads be twitched asunder by those
 3 who

who are resolved to have the liberty of turning with every blast.

He may laugh, if he pleases, at some who *take occasion, from the form of declaration of assent, to brand those who presume to doubt, or differ from them in any of their* IMAGINARY ORTHODOX *notions, with the imputation of perjury, or at least of hypocrisy*¹; for whosoever sets up these principles must be guilty of one or both; and though the author were master of as much ridicule as a late *Irish Dean*, any plain man, who will abide by his honesty, might upon this subject, at least, be an overmatch for him.

But he has found out a remedy which he esteems sufficient, if not to remove these difficulties, yet to make him *pretty easy*^m under them; if not to heal the wound, yet to stupify the part in such a manner, as to render it insensible of pain: for though by the express words of the declaration, every clergyman is obliged to declare his *unfeigned assent, and consent to all and every thing contained and prescribed in, and by the book of common prayer*; yet since it is said in the
act

¹ P. 17.

^m P. 12.

act of uniformity, that he shall declare his assent, and consent *to the use of* all things contained in the said book, he may read the declaration with a *latent reference*^a, to the intention of the act, and thereby assent to nothing more than *the use of* the things, which, in the essay-writer's opinion, is *very different from assenting to the things themselves*^o.

All of which may be obviated by inverting his assertion, and supposing, that the intention of the act is to be gathered immediately from the words of the declaration, not the intent of the declaration, from the words of the act; and in this we shall have the reason of the thing on our side: for the act of uniformity was unquestionably made to introduce this declaration, wherein we assent *to the things themselves*; and to suppose that it is so unhappily worded as to defeat its own purpose, is to cast a very strange reflection upon those that made it.

Besides, it is enjoined by the act, that the declaration be made *in those words and no other*; which does so absolutely exclude all reference to any other words not therein expressed,

^a P. 16.^o P. 12.

expressed, that he may as well attempt to qualify them with an act passed in the reign of *Henry* the Eighth, as with this, passed in the reign of *Charles* the Second.

But even granting (which I have no right or reason to do) either that these words were transplanted from the act into the declaration; or that in the declaration he might be indulged with a *latent reference* to them, this would not set the matter right. For in the book of Common Prayer, *to the use* of which he gives his assent, are there not *creeds* and *articles*, as well as offices, prayers, and suffrages? And how a *creed*, or an article of doctrine, can possibly be *used* otherways than by being *believed*, I own, I am wholly unable to devise. And this will shew, that the *uniformity of profession*, he would contend for, cannot possibly subsist, without an *uniformity of faith*: for as the *profession*, which is to be *uniform*, must be a *profession of faith*, still the difficulty will remain, unless indeed, by the dextrous chop of a logical weapon, it is possible to split the words *profession of faith*, and shew that a man's *profession* is one thing, and his *faith* another.

In

In short——Our Articles are articles of doctrine; and therefore every declaration of *unfeigned assent and consent* to them, strictly implies a *belief* of them: and when the author takes upon him to insinuate that *a man, for prudential reasons, may honestly subscribe and submit to the use of one established form, though he, in his private opinion, may think another to be better*, it is in other words, a man may solemnly declare that he believes, what he does not believe, and yet be an honest man; nay, that he believes such things, as no man can be either honest or christian without believing, whether he declares it publicly or not.

Before I drop this subject, I must humbly take the leave of remonstrating to the author, that he knows all these shifts and evasions to be insufficient—For if a clergyman may *profess* what he does not *believe*; or if a subscription for peace-sake to an establish'd form be all that is required, what is it that makes him so restless; and whence proceeds his vast desire of correcting that form? Is it to set his brethren right in articles of faith? No: that he esteems useless and impracticable; and yet, in flat contradiction

to this principle, it is the purpose of his whole book to contend for it. But error is seldom so happy as to be consistent with itself; and from these contradictory principles, when laid together, it appears, that articles of faith, when drawn up according to his fancy, *are* necessary; but when obtruded upon the world, according to the analogy of scripture, and the judgment of others, they are *not*.

As the affair of a *fraudulent subscription* hath been largely and fully treated by Dr. *Waterland*, and that in a much better manner than it can ever be done by me, I refer the reader to his *Case of Arian Subscription*, and the *Supplement* to it, which have, and always may give general satisfaction upon this point; and if the author had read them, he might have found a much greater difficulty in making himself, as he hath done, so *easy* under these circumstances.

Having thus endeavoured to misrepresent the *subscription* of the Protestant clergy, in order to effect for himself some imaginary deliverance from the obligation of it, he proceeds to set that of the *Nicene* bishops in the same light; that their subscription,
when

when falsely charged with the same frauds, and degraded to a like insignificancy, may keep his own in countenance. He tells us, that at the council of *Nice*, the Emperor Constantine *allowed every one to put their own sense upon the word consubstantial, and not the sense that was intended by the compilers of the creed: and accordingly, Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, though he at first refused subscribing, yet when he was allowed to interpret the word consubstantial, as meaning ONLY, that the Son was not of the same substance with the creatures that were made by him; he then subscribed it, and so, in a little time after did Arius^p. I will not say that I suspect all this to be false, because I can prove, that there is not one word of truth in it, from beginning to end; which the author, perhaps being conscious of, has spared us the trouble of being referred to his authorities.*

For in the first place, the Emperor did not allow any of the subscribers to put a sense upon the word *consubstantial*, different from that intended by the compilers of the creed; and it would have been very strange,

D 2

if

if he had instructed the Bishops how to understand a creed of their own compiling, being then but a *catechumen*, and neither then nor ever after so assuming as here represented. The word (*Homoöusios*) *consubstantial*, was added to the creed by general consent, and is explained, not as meaning ONLY, *that the Son was not of the same substance with the creatures that were made by him*; but according to the express words of *Eusebius*, which I here give at length, *that the Son of God hath no community with, or resemblance to created beings; but that in every respect he is like to the Father only, who hath begotten him; and that he does exist of NO OTHER SUBSTANCE OR ESSENCE BUT OF THE FATHER.* To this (adds *Eusebius*) thus explained we thought good to give our assent; more especially, because we also knew, that some of the ancient learned and eminent Bishops and writers have made use of this term *Homoöusios*, in their explications of the divinity of the Father and of the Son. Thus much therefore we have said concerning the creed published (at Nice) to which WE ALL AGREED, not inconsiderately and without examination, but according to the SENSES GIVEN, which

which were discussed in the presence of our most pious Emperor, and for the fore-mentioned reasons received with UNANIMOUS CONSENT¹. Now what appearance is there in all this, either that the subscription of *Eusebius* was fraudulent, or that the Emperor indulged the subscribers with a private sense of their own; when all the Bishops who were present at the *Nicene* council, subscribed the creed according to senses given and agreed upon: five only, out of three hundred and eighteen, being recusants? Not the least appearance in the world! but as the faithful Bp. *Bull* observes, *Quis cordatus fidem habebit mendacissimo isli hominum generi*? Tho' I am really concerned to see a man of learning engaged in this bad cause, yet at the same time I rejoice to find, that the advocates for *Arianism* think and know, that it cannot be kept from falling to the ground, but by a chain of forgeries.

But we have not yet done with them: for the subscription of *Arius* is mentioned in so artful a manner, and shuffled in with that of *Eusebius*, as to make the reader suppose

¹ Socrat. Hist. lib. I. ch. 3.
p. 144. §. 4.

² Def. Fid. Nic.

pose they were both of the same complexion: whereas, in truth, no two circumstances could be more singularly different. The latter assented to the *consubstantiality* of the Son, in terms sufficiently clear and strong; but the former, under the most wicked subterfuge. We are told, that he *wrote* down his own heretical opinion upon a piece of paper, which he concealed in his bosom; then appeared boldly before the Emperor, signed the creed, and took an oath that he did really think—as he had *written*°. It will not be impertinent, I hope, to add from the history of *Socrates*, what follows concerning him; in which, though there are some coarse and disagreeable images, yet, as they are inseparable from the relation, the reader will make the best of them. “ But divine vengeance
 “ closely pursued *Arius’s* audaciousness; for
 “ when he departed from the imperial palace, a terror proceeding from a consciousness of his impiety seized him, which
 “ was followed by such an unaccountable
 “ disorder in his bowels, as occasioned him,
 “ together with a large quantity of blood,
 “ to

° Socr. Hist. lib. I. ch. 28.

“ to discharge his spleen and liver, so that
 “ he died immediately.”—I hope we shall
 hear no more of *Arius’s* subscription.

We are now returning once more to the
act of uniformity; for it seems (to the essay-
 writer) that these words, to the use of, were
 omitted (in the declaration) with design, as
 a snare to oblige poor conscientious men to
 give up their livings: and accordingly, he
 tells us, that there were 1800 persons de-
 prived of their livings, rather than submit
 to the terms prescribed^t. This, besides be-
 ing an invidious slander against the legisla-
 tive powers, affords us a specimen of that
 benevolence towards people of all sects, or
 of none, so much admired by the free and
 candid ones of the present age, and passed
 off upon the world for that true spirit of
 love to our *Christian* brethren, so much in-
 sisted upon in the Gospel.

While fiery and infatuated bigotry pre-
 vails in the church of *Rome*, under the
 name of *zeal*, I cannot but observe (and
 truth, when observ’d, can offend no reason-
 able man) that this *Laodicean* coldness and
 insensibility prevails amongst us, under that
 of

of *charity* : both of them so destructive of all true religion, that it is difficult to say which is the most pernicious. If we bring them to the holy scripture, that divine standard, by which all virtues and vices are to be measured, we may form a proportionate judgment of them, by the different rebukes they have both received from the mouth of *Christ* : to the former it is said, *ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of* : to the latter, *I will spue thee out of my mouth*. Bigots mistake and exceed the *Christian spirit* ; they are much too tall for the standard-mark : but your *benevolent* ones crouch down, and are afraid of reaching up to it, lest they should be enlisted as *Christian* soldiers into the army of the King of Kings, and carried forth to the battle. Those who indulge this lazy luke-warm principle, may, while they endeavour to avoid it, give as much real offence to the sincere believers, as even the bigotry of *Rome* itself can do to a dissenter, and be unawares carried out into the most dangerous lengths of heretical licentiousness ; since its humour is, to palliate every the most abominable deviation from the orthodox faith,

faith, established by *Christ* and his Apostles, and received by the church as the only lasting bond of its indispensable union, with the soft phrase of, *a different mode of thinking!*

One of these modern advocates for separatists and enthusiasts of all denominations, had the following observation made to him by a friend, who with a proper indignation interrupted his harangue, and said, “ Sir, “ I believe you have *charity* for *the devil* ;” at which he, not at all moved, mildly replied, “ Why, *poor spirit*, one may hope “ that there is mercy in store for him !” How near the *author’s* benevolence approaches to the instance here mentioned, I will not take upon me to determine ; but let the reader judge for himself, when he considers, that these *poor conscientious men* were no other than the *Oliverian* schismatics, who in their spirit of Christian meekness, sought God by plundering the state, destroying the church, murdering the King, and defiling the altars of *Christ*.—*Why, poor spirits!*

Mr. *Echard* gives us the following account of them—“ If considered altogether, “ they were a confus’d mass and body of

E

“ several

“ several sects, and men of different prin-
 “ ciples, many of whom mortally hated
 “ each other; and if it be remember’d,
 “ how many of them had been unjust in-
 “ truders, trumpets, and incendiaries in the
 “ late miseries of the nation, and unmerci-
 “ ful persecutors of the legal clergy of *En-*
 “ *gland*; and likewise, how few were wil-
 “ ling to disown their seditious practices,
 “ it is no wonder, &c.” We are told in
 the same page, “ that there was more
 “ sound doctrine preach’d throughout the
 “ kingdom in one twelvemonth after their
 “ *fatal Bartholomew* (the day on which
 “ these *poor spirits* were discharg’d) than
 “ had been in nigh twenty years before.”

I have set down at *p.* 14. a very extra-
 ordinary expression of the essay-writer’s *ima-*
ginary orthodox notions! which is such a
 bare-fac’d indignity, such an affronting slight
 upon the important doctrines held by the
 Protestant church of *England*, that I am
 pretty confident it cannot have passed un-
 observ’d: and a small degree of penetration
 will enable the reader to foresee from it,
 what *his notions*, when extracted, will be
 concerning

concerning *orthodoxy*, together with its opposites, *heresy* and *schism*.

First then, for his *orthodoxy*; which according to the common sense of the word, is constituted by the established religion of any country: and hence it comes to pass, that a person may be esteemed as very orthodox in England or Ireland, who would be deemed as an heretic at Rome, or in other countries^w. *Orthodoxy* then, is nothing fix'd and stated, but changes its nature according to the different temper of the climate it resides in, and *Chameleon*-like, can assume any colour it chances to sit upon, and still be as good *orthodoxy* as it was before. This, it seems, is gathered from the *common sense* of the word: but if what is here taken as the common sense of *orthodoxy*, be an *erroneous* or *abused sense*, nothing but error can depend upon it, or be fairly inferred from it. And that it is such, must be evident to every one who is able to construe the *Greek* (*ορθοδοξία*) or knows that in the primitive ages, it was used only to denote *the right opinion*, that is, the Christian faith in general, as received in the Catholic church.

E 2

planted

^w Ded. p. 23, 24.

planted by the Apostles, which, in their days, was one and the same all the world over; and none but the faithful members of this *one* communion were termed *orthodox*. To this purpose *Justin Martyr* observes, ορθοδοξοι σι μονοι θεω αρεσκοντες ^x, *the orthodox only are pleasing unto God*: and so *Theodoret*, τῷ υπερ των αποστολικων δογματων αγωνιζομενω, ορθο-δοξου ονομα ^y, *we call him orthodox, who earnestly contends for the apostolic doctrines, that is, the faith once delivered to the saints by the Apostles*. Thus also, when it is said of the three thousand converted *Jews* ^z, that *they continued steadfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship*, it is perfectly the same, as if they were declared, in one word, to have been *orthodox*: and therefore, every particular church now subsisting in the world, is *more or less* orthodox, in proportion as it approaches nearer to, or is more remote from, the purity of the apostolic times.

But, on the contrary, if any point of doctrine, whether right or wrong, may, by a strange abuse of the word, be esteemed *orthodox*, because it makes a part of the *established*

^x Qu. 1. ad Orth.

^y Pref. ad Dial.

^z Acts ii. 42.

blished religion of any country ; then the author's definition, if admitted and applied, will prove that any particular church may be *orthodox*, where it is *beterodox* ; which is, what we commonly call, a contradiction in terms. And yet, proceeding upon a fallacy, so easily detected, he descants, thro' twenty pages, upon the crime of *heresy* ; measuring it all the way, by this his false standard of equivocal orthodoxy, and setting it forth as an insignificant deviation from any established form, which, as it happens, may be sometimes right, and sometimes wrong. I will run over these pages, and extract in short, as well as I can, the sum of that doctrine they contain.

Accordingly, I find, that six of them^a may be reduced to the following propositions—The Christianity of the Apostles, was, by the blind Scribes and Pharisees of the *Jews*, called *heresy*—and therefore, *it is possible that an heretic may be in the right*.

No ; nothing can possibly be inferred from hence, but that a person who is *in the right*, may be *falsely called* an heretic by those, who are *in the wrong*. Which
conclusion

^a From p. 22. to 28.

conclusion can answer no purpose in the world ; and farther than this, I apprehend, he cannot go : for it is not in the power of argument to shew, that the word *heretic*, when applied by some to one who is in the *wrong*, and by others, to one who is in the *right*, should signify the very same thing ; and unless it is, his conclusion becomes void, and of no effect.

Amidst his discourse upon heresy, he is pleased to produce a text from *St. Paul*, in which, by the assistance of a large comment, the Apostle is tortured till he delivers a very singular account of this crime, together with the reasons for which the church is impowered to inflict a punishment upon those that are guilty of it : an account, so foreign from the purpose of that glorious instrument of the Holy Spirit, that I dare be confident, he would rather have suffered martyrdom, than have submitted to deliver it. The text is this—*A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject : knowing that he that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself*^b. From which, the author presumes
in

^b Tit. III. 10, 11.

in his comment, that an heretic is such, not for the sake of any destructive opinion he maintains in opposition to the truth, and to the extreme peril of his own soul, but that *he sinneth, by persevering therein after admonition*; and that this *perverseness of his will, not the error of his judgment, is the cause and foundation of his excommunication*°.

So that it is the *admonition* an heretic receives from the church, which makes him become guilty of that very crime, for which he is *admonished*; and he commences a compleat heretic immediately upon his excommunication, and not before: because, if it is the ecclesiastical censure which renders him guilty, his guilt must increase with the severity of that censure; and when the censure hath arisen to its full growth, the crime likewise must have done the same. But a small attention to this matter will enable us to perceive, that here we have a false account of *schism*, instead of a true account of *heresy*; and that upon this the author proceeds in what follows.

For it is declared moreover in these words of *St. Paul*, that an heretic is *self-condemn'd*;

at

at which passage we are directed by a very judicious marginal reference, to *Acts* xiii. 46. where *Paul* and *Barnabas* tell the *Jews*, upon their rejecting the Christian faith, that they *judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life*. This therefore was supposed by those pious men, who made the reference, to contain that very sentence of condemnation, which an heretic passes upon himself; and properly enough, as might be shewed at large. But the essay-writer, agreeable to his usual method of taking the perspective by the wrong end, diminishes it down to a petty conviction only, of his wilful *perseverance in opposition to the church*: which exposition does not touch upon the meaning of the text, since in other words it will stand thus—*An heretic is sensible that he is condemned by the church*—whereas, on the contrary, the Apostle has asserted in terms, that he is *condemned by himself*; that is, he is sensible of his guilt, and accused by his own conscience. From the whole of what our author hath said upon this subject, we may collect this unscriptural definition of heresy—It is an offence, not against the revealed will of God, and the concerns of

eternity; but against the will of man, and the transitory regulations of this life; not against the faith, but against the church that abides by it. Which, in effect, is to suggest, that the church sanctifies the faith; whereas, on the other hand, it is always taken for granted, that the faith sanctifies the church.

And what are the motives which excite him thus to diminish this vice, and improve it if possible, by *speaking smooth things*, and *prophefying deceits* about it, almost into a christian virtue? Why it seems the words *schismatic* and *heretic*, are sounds, which, ever since the days of Popery, occasion wondrous horror in the ears of the vulgar^d. And as he is apprehensive, that many of his brethren, upon discovering his attempt to corrupt the doctrines of the church, and disturb the peace of it, will load him with these opprobrious names; he esteems it his interest to explain away their true meaning, and to brand those with the name of superstitious and papistical *vulgar*, who shall apply to him in their proper sense, such nauseous appellations. By this means, whatever noise

F

they

^d P. 19.

they shall chance to make in *his ears*, he may contemplate his own interpretation of them, and continue to enjoy his repose.

I cannot better obviate these dangerous insinuations, than by setting down a true description of *heresy*, as it stands in the Holy Scriptures; which being dictated by the infallible Spirit of God, and written before the *days of popery*, cannot be charged with inflaming the account of any vice, or of adulterating its own divine truth with any hot and impure spirits, distilled therefrom in after-ages, by the superstitious church of *Rome*. To proceed then—

2 Pet. ii. 1. *There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, or (αἵρεσεις ἀπωλείας) heresies of destruction. Heresies, therefore, are damnable; that is, they lead their advocates and propagators to destruction; and in general they are privily brought in, (παρεισαγωγῇ) they are carried round about, and introduced at some private entrance; they do not make their approach with that undisguised honesty, which fears no discovery, but steal into the household of faith — under the masque of conscience.*

The apostle goes on—even *denying the Lord that bought them*—yea, these *false teachers* shall, to compleat their guilt, even dare to deny the Lord that *bought them*, either by rejecting the ransom he hath condescended to pay for them, or by disowning that he, who paid that ransom, was *the LORD*.

The remaining part of the verse declares, that they *shall bring upon themselves swift destruction*, though for a short time they may escape the terror of an earthly tribunal, yet the eye of God can penetrate into the inmost recesses of their hearts, pursuing them through all their dark and intricate windings; and his arm will at length drag them forth from their hiding places, to appear at the bar of his tribunal, whose mercy and long-suffering they have abused and affronted; though they may delude themselves with the vain presumption that they can contradict God, and yet be in the right; that the matter they are upon is *barely speculative*, and such as God careth not for; yet if their crime be such as the apostle here means to describe, their *judgment now of a*
F 2
long

long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.

In 1 *Tim.* iv. 1. Heretics, or those who depart from the truth, and sollicit others to *follow their pernicious ways*, are called *seducing spirits*, or persons actuated by that original seducer, who first tempted man to apostatize from the wisdom of God, and to follow his own lascivious fancy, in contradiction to an express command of his maker: their heresies are termed *doctrines of devils*, invented by the adversary, and set up as rivals to the pure and saving doctrines of *Christ*; and those who set forth and propagate such doctrines, are declared to be *ministers of Satan*^e, artfully substituting and diligently preaching his word of death, instead of the *word of life*; nay proceeding so far as to call the former by the name of the latter, that they may render it the more palatable, and tempt their hearers to swallow down such poisonous impurities with greediness.

This I take to be the true account of heresy, because the scripture gives it me, and because I find it insisted upon as such by all the

^e 2 *Cor.* xi. 15.

the pious writers of the ancient church, now so much despised and neglected : and if it is the true, surely we ought to tremble at seeing this destructive evil with many specious subtilties recommended to the world, under the soft phrases of *an opinion barely speculative, a different mode of thinking !* If an *heretic* means no more than *one of a different opinion from the majority*^f, whether that majority think right or wrong ; if, I say, this reasoning be true, then the scriptures are false ; and the essay-writer, I fear, hath too much penetration, not to discern, that this alternative is unavoidable.

As I have alluded to the term, *barely speculative*, it may not be amiss more fully to remark this *writer's* strange misapplication of it : for, is it not astonishing, that by *opinions barely speculative*, he would have us understand the chief and fundamental mysteries of the christian faith ; nay, that very root and stock, from whence groweth all moral obligation to us as *Christians*, all strength and comfort in this world, and all our hope of everlasting salvation in the next ? All this, as depending upon the *doctrine of*
the

the Trinity, is, it seems, nothing but a mere lifeless theory, an empty subject for the mind to exercise its curiosity upon, and concerning which, it may think and imagine for itself with as great freedom, as it does about any baseless and airy fabric of modern *metaphysics*. But it is evident that the scriptures give no warrant to this distinction of *speculative* and *practical* duties; for when the *Jews* put the following question to *Christ*—*What shall we do that we might work the works of God?* his answer was—*This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.* Where then is the difference between faith and works?

Since the principles of the christian faith, in common with those of all other religions, are (in the author's opinion) *barely speculative*; he seems to wonder that *men should be more displeased with one another for any difference of opinion about them, than for their being of different sizes or complexions*; and observes, that *for this, no reason in general can indeed be assigned**, as to the squabbles of *Pagans* and the devilish malignity of *Mahometans*, concerning their wicked delusions and

and abominations, they are entirely out of the question, though he is pleased to suppose they are not, by complaining of this unaccountable *degree of animosity, as practised in all countries, and almost in all ages*^b.

But as to the differences between men professing themselves *Christians*, some of whom really are what they profess to be, while others are not; though a reason *in general* cannot be assigned for them, we are pretty sure that a reason in particular may, and that a very strong and cogent one, having nothing less for its sanction than the authority of the Holy Spirit. For *whosoever abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, is not to be received by us into our houses, neither are we to bid him God speed, (that is, we are not in any wise to encourage his attempt, or promote the success of it) for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds*ⁱ. And our blessed Lord himself tells his apostles, that if any one *neglect to hear the church, he should be unto them as an heathen man and a publican*; adding withal (on a very proper occasion) that divine authority upon which the church is to proceed—*Whatsoever ye shall*

^b *Ibid.*

ⁱ 2 John ix. 10, 11.

shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven^k. And though it be now esteemed necessary that we should entertain very moderate and qualified sentiments about such passages as these; yet, we must not forget, that in the scriptures, there are such.

Seeing, therefore, it is absolutely requisite that there should be a proper degree of authority in the church, grounded upon the commands of God; and a distinction or difference preserved between such as are humble and believing, and such as are refractory and unbelieving, lest by encouraging the guilty, the innocent should partake of their crimes; it is somewhat strange that the *Reverend Essay-writer* should spend several pages in the unnatural endeavour of bringing about a coalition between *Christians, Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics*; not considering, that amongst such, it is impossible there should be any community of sentiment, or any hearty reconciliation. For if those who are on the right side are quiet and at rest, those on the wrong, are, through the implacable spirit of him that *from the beginning*

^k Matt. xviii. 17, 18.

beginning was a murderer, so restless and malignant, that they never will, or can be ; and for the truth of this, I might appeal to the testimony of all ages.

When there lieth open that plain middle road, of resting upon the *most certain warrants of holy scripture*, and of having such a degree of charity for mankind, as to encourage none of them in sin, this he will not attend to, but flies off on the one side, and descants upon *fire and faggot*, as the sanction of human appointments in the church of *Rome* ; and on the other, runs away with an invitation after *Christian Priests, Bramins, and Muftis*, jovially to associate them, as it were, in a *midnight modern conversation* ; for an agreement between them, is utterly inconsistent with any sober intentions.—But with all this, there is somewhat of a railing accusation intermixt ; for as the *conduct of mankind* (it should be *of Christians*) *is quite otherways* in this respect, that is, as they sometimes disagree, and will have *no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them* ; he thinks this can be *attributed to nothing but a vicious pride in our natures,*

which gives us an aversion for every one that differs in opinion from us. Was it always an act of *pride* then in the church, when she excommunicated an heretic? And cannot a believer assert the articles of his faith, and endeavour, if not to convince, at least to confute a *gainsayer*, without being called *proud*? God forbid. We will never believe that those salutary precepts, which He hath given us for the regulation and welfare of his church, can, unless they are abused, be unto us an *occasion of falling*.

But let us examine this a little farther; for, if where this conduct is to be found, if where any person expresses a dislike or abhorrence for another, on account of his religious principles, there a *vicious pride* is also to be found; this will charge a vicious pride upon the *Son of God* himself, who while his soul overflowed with tenderness for an unbelieving and abandoned nation, could yet say to them, *ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?* And again, *ye are of your father the devil*. St. Paul in like manner said to the Jews who refused to hear him, *your blood be upon your own heads*; taking it

for granted that they were given over to destruction: and, on another occasion, he hath this severe reflection concerning some, who by false doctrines made Christ of none effect: *I would they were even cut off, which trouble you.* That glorious martyr *Policarp* likewise, who lived in the age of the apostles, and was by them ordained bishop of *Smyrna*, happened one day to meet *Marcion* the heretic, who said to him, “ what? will “ you not acknowledge me?” “ Yes, answered he, I acknowledge thee for the first- “ born of *satan*¹,” which, I presume, would have sounded very harsh in the ears of a *candid disquisitor*.

This being a reflection, therefore, of which they upon whom he would cast it, are altogether unworthy; I may, without the least injustice, return it back upon the *heretical herd*; for they are the men, who abound with a *vicious pride*. This it is, which gives them their incurable itch of singularity, and inclines them to prefer their own fallacious reasonings and groundless opinions, to the dictates of the *Most High*. As the following are the words of *St. Ignatius*

G 2

upon

¹ *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. 4. Ch. 14.*

upon this subject, I hope I may adopt his sentiments for my own, and set them down without giving offence. “ The spirit of
 “ error vaunteth itself, and proclaimeth its
 “ own excellencies ; it seeketh to gratify
 “ its own will and pleasure, and humour
 “ its desire of vain glory ; it is full of disdain, lying, fraudulent, soothing and
 “ flattering, artful, patching things together to make them look plausible, trifling, discordant, never to be silenced, evasive, timorous^m.

In this dedicatory introduction to his essay, our author hath several *pleas* (*arguments* I will not call them) by which he seeks to countenance his vast desire of reforming the doctrine of the Trinity, as it stands at present in our creeds and articles : it remains, therefore, that I extract these, and give them their answers separately according to that order in which they occur.

Plea I. “ If the church be not infallible
 “ any more than the state, why may not
 “ that

^m Το πλανον πνευμα εαυτο κηρυττει, τα ιδια λαλει· αυθαρεσκον γαρ εστιν, εαυτο δοξαζει· τυφω γαρ εστι μεσον, ψευδολογον υπαρχει· απαιηλον, διαπεινικον, κολακευτικον, υπελον, ραψωδον, φλυασον, ασυμφωνον, αμειριστη, γλισχρον, ψοφοδισες. Cited by *Suicer*. V. I. p. 127.

“ that be amended as well as the state ? And
 “ why should we be more afraid of break-
 “ ing the peace of the church than of the
 “ state ? the peace of the one being full as
 “ necessary to be preserved, as the peace of
 “ the otherⁿ.”

No just parallel can, I think, be drawn between the fallibility, or infallibility of the church, and of the state, since they are not directed by the same rule, and are conversant about matters greatly differing from each other : the one about invariable truths, which concern the everlasting happiness of man, and are determined by divine revelation ; the other about national or political principles of its own devising, which as far as they are built upon human authority or national compact, may be varied at pleasure, as the different exigencies of times and occasions shall require ; as far as they partake, in common with the ecclesiastical rule, of divine authority, these are as unalterable as that. If, therefore, it can be clearly proved that any *human errors* have crept into the church, any positions *contradicting* the word of truth, let them, in God's
 name,

name, be reformed: but as to the essential articles or substance of the christian faith, it must for ever remain fixed and unmoveable, as that scripture upon which it depends. As concerning the latter half of the above quotation, it must be confessed, that the peace of the state is necessary to be preserved, and that *for conscience sake* no Christian will dispute it; but I apprehend that the author, by his manner of expression, means to represent the peace of both as absolutely of equal concernment to the welfare of mankind; which is to put things spiritual upon a level with things natural, the things which are seen with those which are not seen, things temporal with things eternal—and falls very little short of downright atheism.

Plea II. “ I am under less apprehension
 “ for the church than for the state; for as
 “ to the christian religion in general, we
 “ have the sure word of prophecy, that
 “ the gates of hell shall not prevail against
 “ it; and as to particular establishments, I
 “ should apprehend, that the freer they
 “ were from errors, the more likely they
 “ would

“ would be to stand.” Tis true, a candlestick with a light burning in it may be removed from one part of the house to another, without extinguishing the light; but, yet, the apartment from which it is removed, having no light but what it received from it, will be left in the dark. The light of christianity will always burn *somewhere* till the end of the world; but no particular church or nation can from this prophecy receive any well grounded encouragement to tamper with the faith, through a vain presumption of its entire continuance, although the members of that church, under the specious pretence of snuffing the candle, are continually endeavouring to put it out. Suppose the christian religion, when expelled from *Great-Britain*, should settle whole and sound in the city of *Amsterdam*, it would give us but cold comfort to reflect, that though the christian religion *in particular* had left us, yet the christian religion *in general* was still subsisting somewhere in the world.

Before any *particular establishment* is freed from its errors, we must ask, who is to judge

judge of those errors ? A council of learned and pious men, assembling in the fear of God, or one solitary objector, who is pleased to think that such reformers complied so far with *the humour of the times*^p in which they lived, as not to have effected a *thorough reformation* ? If we admit the *author's* judgment, we shall have that very doctrine (with many more) expunged as an error, for the renouncing of which the *eastern* churches were totally extirpated, I mean the divinity of the Son of God : for it is universally allowed that *Arianism* was the crime, which chiefly prevailed amongst them, and wrought their destruction.

Plea III. “ It is manifest, that before the
 “ reformation took place, the same argu-
 “ ments were then made use of, against any
 “ innovations in religion that are now ; and
 “ all alterations were as much declaimed
 “ against^q.”

Hence this *writer* means to insinuate, that as a reformation in religion was once made, against an unreasonable opposition, and the church freed from its errors ; a reformation (however opposed) ought to be made

^p P. 19.

^q P. 47.

made again : that is, there always may be a reformation of a reformation ; and because the church, at the time here mentioned, had many errors, and was cleared of them ; therefore she must have many more, and may be cleared of them again. Which is an excellent medium for proving that *Mary Magdalen* had fourteen devils ; and that because seven were cast out, seven more must have staid behind.

Plea IV. “ If a storm should arise (the “ church) may run a risque of having that “ tree torn up by the roots, which might “ have been saved by a little pruning.”

Whence is this storm to arise ? not from any *Papish* power ; because then the most adviseable method would be, not to lop and to *prune*, but to engraft fresh branches upon the old stock. It is therefore to arise from the opposite point of the compass, the stripping party ; and by the *author's* foretelling this storm, he seems to have as formidable an idea of the Dissenters, as if they were able to fly away with us in a whirlwind.

How comes he to confess, that the very persons, in whose behalf he so strongly

H pleads

pleads for a reformation, are a sort of men, which will *tear the tree up by the roots* for us? The *tree*, I take for granted, is the *Christian faith* at present growing in the church of *England*; and we are advised to *prune* it, in order to oblige those, who (tho' a while ago they were set forth as *poor* and *conscientious*) will, rather than fail, *tear it up by the roots*. However, he seems to know his men, and gives us a pretty just character of them, by putting a little storm and tempest into their composition. But what can he mean by a *little pruning*? for it is the design of his essay to set aside the doctrine of the *Trinity in Unity*; and to recommend an alteration of this nature, under the name of a *little pruning*, will be understood by every judicious reader as a most dangerous mistake: for this doctrine, as hath been already observed, is the *root* of the Christian religion; and to prune a tree, by cutting up the root of it, is the way to make the branches, not shoot out and flourish, but wither and decay: and if this be our method of *pruning*, we may bid defiance to the fury of our adversaries; for when his

tempestuous

tempestuous gentlemen come to rip and rend, there will be nothing left for them to do.

Plea V. “ The most proper method that
“ could be taken to render the church of
“ *Ireland* truly *catholic*, would be——to
“ open the gates of its communion as wide
“ as was consistent with the Gospel of
“ Christ :”

How wide the *author* thinks that to be, cannot exactly be determined, till he speaks more explicitly : but we ought to be very cautious how we enter upon this *widening* scheme, for fear of making a fatal mistake—for *strait is the gate which leadeth unto life*; as on the contrary, *wide is the gate which leadeth to destruction, and many there be, which go in thereat*†. It may be said, without giving offence to any sincere believer of the churches of *England* and *Ireland*, that if they were opened as *wide* as some affectedly-moderate and disguised spirits among the Dissenters would have them, they might pretty much resemble those described by the poet,

———The gates wide open stood,
That with extended wings a banner'd host
H 2 Under

† Deed. p. 62.

‡ Matth. vii. 13, 14.

*Under spread ensigns marching, might pass
through
With horse and chariots rank'd in loose
array^u.*

What kind of army that is, which would march through the gates of our communion, were they thus opened, may justly be conceived by taking a review of that confused rout, which, a little above a century ago, when they were torn off their hinges, marched into our churches, tore the sacerdotal vestments, converted the pulpits and communion tables into butchers blocks and shambles, and then cavalcaded in triumph through our streets with surplices over their coats, and tooting upon the broken pipes of organs, which they had chopt down with their pole-axes. At a time when one of these mad processions was making, after the demolition of a church, one of their commanding officers staid behind, with a few choice friends, to christen his horse in his own urine, which he had plentifully discharged into the baptismal-font; and called him *Ball Esau*, because *he was hairy*^w.

And

^u Par. lost. B. II. l. 884.

^w Many shocking accounts of this sort are to be found in *Foulis's History of the Pretended Saints*, B. II. whence this is taken.

And can we think that men of this disposition would ever live in peace and agreement, even supposing that the church of *England* was *swept* and *garnished* in the manner they desire, with *seven wicked spirits* ready to receive them? No: dissention is their profession; and if the church were swallowed up and lost in their schism, they must then dissent from Dissenters, rather than not dissent at all: and this they certainly would do; for it is said of those *poor conscientious men* which were discharged for nonconformity, that even when they were uppermost, and had usurped a tyrannical dominion over the church, they *mortally hated each other*. *Presbyterians, Quakers, Anabaptists*, and all the spawn of dissention, even at this day preach with such implacable animosity against dissenting brethren of different denominations from themselves, that it plainly appears they only want power to persecute them. The *Antitrinitarians* of *England* were anathematized by those of *Poland*^{*}; and this is the compliment which most heretics and separatists are ready to pay each other. In one point indeed they all agree,

^{*} *Leslie*. Theolog. works, fol. v. I. p. 220.

agree, that *Christ* is to be opposed, and his body, the church, torn in pieces ; but they are ready to cut one another's throats about the manner how ; which to those who look on, is but a very bad recommendation of their cause. Therefore, in God's name, let us keep where we are, and leave them to themselves ; let these ungodly men *fall into their own nets together*, but let us ever *escape them*.

Plea VI. ‘ The preface to our *Book of Common Prayer* declares, that “ *the particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions, such changes and alterations may be made therein, as to those that are in place and authority should, from time to time, seem either necessary or expedient.*”

This passage is taken by the essay-writer in as large and unlimited a sense, as if those pious men, who reviewed our excellent Liturgy, had thereby insinuated a permission

to change the essential articles of faith therein contained, according to the various humours of every age; or to alter the *doctrine of the Trinity*, &c. in such a manner, as that the Liturgy might always wear a garb suitable to the cut of the times. If they intended that a more restrained sense should be put upon their concession, it will do him little or no service; for it cannot in any shape answer his purpose, or countenance *his* proposed method of reformation, unless it be made to appear, that by such *forms of divine worship, rites, and ceremonies*, as are *in their own nature indifferent and alterable*, they mean *Creeds, Articles*, and all other *essentials* of the *Liturgy*; since these are the points wherein he would contend for an alteration. But this is such an indulgence, as those faithful and judicious men well knew they had neither a right to grant, nor a liberty to accept of; and if they are permitted to speak for themselves, they will soon be cleared of the accusation here brought against them. For nothing can more expressly set aside such a Latitudinarian acceptance of their words, or more justly characterize all our reforming adventurers, than
the

the lines which immediately follow the above passage, extracted from their Preface to the *Book of Common Prayer*. Their observation is this, “ accordingly we find, that “ in the reigns of several Princes of blessed memory since the reformation, the “ church, upon just and weighty considerations, her thereunto moving, hath yielded to make such alterations in *some particulars*, as in their respective times were “ thought convenient: yet *so*, as that the “ *main body* and *essentials* of it (as well in “ the *chiefest materials*, as in the frame and “ order thereof) have still continued the “ same unto this day; and do yet stand “ firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all “ the vain attempts, and impetuous assaults “ made against it, by such men as are *given to change*, and have always discovered a “ greater regard to their own *private fancies* “ and interests, than to that duty they owe “ to the public.” They likewise inform us, that after the restoration, “ divers pamphlets were published against the *Book of Common Prayer*, by those who under the “ usurped powers had made it their business to render the people disaffected there-

“ unto; the old objections were mustered
 “ up, with the addition of some new ones,
 “ to make the number swell.” And that
 at the time of their review, “ of the sundry
 “ alterations proposed to them, they re-
 “ jected all such as were either of dangerous
 “ consequence (as *secretly striking at some*
 “ *established doctrine*, or laudable practice
 “ of the church of *England*, or indeed of
 “ the whole Catholic church of *Christ*) or
 “ else, of no consequence at all, but utterly
 “ frivolous and vain.”

It might have been as prudent therefore
 in the author, not to have meddled with
 this Preface; since it is directed throughout
 against all such changeable minds, as “ seek
 “ occasion of cavil, or quarrel against the
 “ Liturgy of the church.” But it is his
 method to extract a scrap, and either by
 quoting it wrong, or interpreting it falsely,
 to make a writer speak what sense he pleases;
 which is a mighty disingenuous practice,
 but frequently to be met with in his book,
 as the reader must already have observed,
 and will many times more, before I have
 done with it.

And now, after having seen the very peculiar cast of his reasonings against the articles of faith established (by the blessing of God) in the church of *England*, we cannot be at a loss to know what he means by that *freedom of thinking*, which he supposes to have been promoted by the legislature, *not only since the reformation, but even since the revolution*^y: and likewise what sort of principles they are, from whence arises that air of triumph, with which he observes, that the *eyes of mankind have* (of late) *been greatly opened*^z. If their eyes are opened so wide as to make them, instead of truth, see nothing but the intricate error of their own imaginations, and, instead of submitting to divine revelation, to know what God is, better than he himself does; happy would it be for them, if they were still blind. But I have such an opinion of my brethren and countrymen, as to think, that, many of them at least, whatever they *may be* in time to come, are not yet persuaded, that *all* knowledge, and wisdom, and judgment, is within the compass of their own free and unrestrained reason: and, that such

a

^y Ded. p. 63.^z Ibid.

a suggestion as this, may now, and always, be a *slander* against the greater half of them, is all the harm I wish them.

WE are now entering upon the work itself, the *Essay on Spirit*; which, I presume, is so called by the author, because, in the beginning of this piece, he lays down a short system of metaphysical speculations, concerning the nature and essence of God, the Spirit of the world, or *anima mundi*, the operations and essence of the soul of man, together with the existence and power of angels or created spirits. But before he hath advanced many steps into this system, he flies off into objections against the divinity of *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*; works up his own metaphysical principles, with what is revealed in the Old and New Testament concerning them, and then cements the whole together with those impure traditions of the *Rabbies*, which originally made the word of God of none effect, and were insisted upon by the *Jews*, after their dispersion, on purpose to deface and obscure the doctrines of the primitive Christian church.

It is not my intention to confront his system with another of the like nature, or to launch out into any metaphysical disquisitions upon these points; since to argue in this speculative manner, and to proceed merely upon conjecture, is to *fight as one that beateth the air*; and instead of shewing his errors, nothing could hereby be manifested but my own weakness, enough of which may perhaps appear, without my diving into the cold obscure of *metaphysics*. I shall therefore meddle with this system, no farther than as it clashes with revealed truths, and shall remark, as I go along, his abuse of Heathen learning, and misapplication of the holy scriptures; in doing which, we shall find that his speculations, altho' they appear in a modern garb, are very ancient, since they may plainly be traced up to their origin, *Gentile philosophy*.

If, in the course of these remarks, I should sometimes be obscure and immethodical, I hope it will be chiefly owing to the author's less perspicuous manner of treating his subject: for when I peruse his book, I confess myself often puzzled to perceive the connection; and his arguments are frequently

quently so dispersed, that it is no easy matter to collect them. However, that I may the more readily be understood, I shall divide my reply into several chapters: the *first* of which shall comprehend his notions concerning the nature and essence of God, the Spirit of the universe, and the human soul—the *second*, those relating to the existence and power of created spirits—the *third*, his objections against the divinity of the *Son*—the *fourth*, his objections against that of the *Holy Spirit*—the *fifth*, the extent and validity of his conclusion—the *sixth*, his enquiry into the sentiments of the primitive Fathers—the *seventh*, his misapplication of the Heathen *Trinities*—the *eighth* and last, his remarks upon the *Atbanasian* and *Nicene* Creeds.

C H A P.

C H A P. I.

In which his notions concerning the nature and essence of God, the Spirit or Instinct of the universe, and the soul of man, are considered.

IT must give us some surprize, to see the first scene of this *essay* open with an atheist giving his definition of God ; that is, of what he was pleased to assume for the supreme Governor of the universe. For the author tells us, “ The opinion of *Spinoza* “ was, that there is no other *substance* in “ nature but God : that modes cannot sub- “ sist, or be conceived, without a substance : “ that there is nothing in nature, but modes “ and substances : and that therefore every “ thing must be conceived as subsisting in “ *God*^a.” By which, if I am so happy as to understand him, he means——that as there is nothing in nature but *modes*, or various manifestations of impressed action ; and as these *modes* cannot subsist without a *substance*, therefore all the motion or action which appears in nature, must proceed from
the

^a *Essay*, p. 1.——*Spin. Op. Posth. Eth. par. I. p. 12.*

the intimate presence of *God's substance* expanded through the universe. Which opinion of *Spinoza*, hath always been allowed to terminate in *atheism*; because if pursued, it proves that the universal substance of nature, animated by a concomitant intelligence, is *God*: which substance being nothing more than inanimate matter, and the modes therein observable owing to material or *second* causes, under the direction and influence of the *supreme*, leaves us without any God at all, except that which all idolaters have allowed, *the creature rather than the Creator*.

How far the author's opinion co-incides with this of *Spinoza*, will appear as we proceed. For according to him, " It may be asserted that there is in nature but one self-existent being, subsistence, or substance, which by way of eminence, may therefore be called *the substance*, or, figuratively and comparatively speaking, the *only being, subsistence, or substance in nature*^b." As to the first part of this sentence, we grant that there is but one *self-existent being*; but it cannot follow from hence,

hence, that there is but one *subsistence* or *substance*; because a *substance* (except when it is improperly used for the word *essence*) always implies something *material*; whereas a *being* may be either *material* or *immaterial*. However, to make this somewhat plausible, he “ would be understood to “ mean by these three words (*being*, *sub-* “ *sistence*, and *substance*) one and the same “ thing^c:” that when the words are granted to be synonymous, whatever is proved of a *being*, may hold good of a *substance*; which is not arguing, but equivocating. I take notice of this, because, in the next page, the scripture is introduced giving its verdict in favour of this opinion. “ When “ *Moses* (says he) enquired of God, by “ what name he should make him known “ to the children of *Israel*, God said, thus “ shalt thou say—I AM *hath sent me unto* “ *you*—which is rendered by the *Sept.* εγω “ εμὶ ο ων, *I am he that is*, or that exists; “ as if, comparatively speaking, there was “ no other *being* or *existence* but God^d.” In this comment, the *essay-writer* hath dropt the words *subsistence* and *substance*,
and

^c P. 2.^d P. 3.

and introduced only those of *being* and *existence*: but as he would be understood to mean the same thing by all of them, we have his own authority for substituting one for the other as we think proper; and then his paraphrase upon $\epsilon\gamma\omega \epsilon\mu\mu \sigma \omega\iota$ will be, “ I am he that *subsists*; as if there were no “ other *substance* but *God*.” He adds, that “ from this passage it probably was, that “ *Plato* borrowed his notion of the name “ of *God*, when he asserted that the word “ $\epsilon\gamma\omega$, *est*, is solely applicable to the nature “ of *God*. And from him it probably was, “ that the word $\epsilon\iota$, *thou art*, was written on “ the door of the *Delphic* temple^e.” But the original text can, I apprehend, afford no room either for this comment, or for introducing these Heathen parallels. It is $\text{אֲהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיָּה}$, where the *Hebrew* root of the verb אֲהִיָּה *I am*, is הוּא הוֹוֵה *to be*; from whence is plainly derived the word יְהוָה *Jehovah*, which when given under a paraphrase, doth not *comparatively* denote the *only being* or *substance*, but strictly and properly, Him *which was, and is, and is to come*; and expresses the *self-existence* or *essential*

K

essential eternity of the divine nature, as distinguished from *created* Beings, which have a beginning *a parte antè*, and a dependent duration *a parte post*.

As for the speculations of *Plato*, &c. concerning their false God, it is impossible to make them square rightly with the inspired appellations of the true; and such authorities being extremely vague and uncertain, will at any rate do the *author's* cause no service; for it is by no means clear that *Plato* asserts that the word εἷς is solely applicable to the divine nature; since he also asserts, that it is applicable to the essence of the human soul^f. And moreover, while *Plato* tells us that οὐρανός (or as he hath it in the neuter gender τὸ οὐν) is the only Being that *exists*; his scholar *Aristotle* holds that it is the only Being which is abstracted from existence, or which does *not exist*. Those who are fond of such contradictions, may enjoy them whole and entire if they please; but when they are introduced to the depravation of any sacred truth, we must then be obliged (whether it be civil or not) to drive them off with a *procul este profana*!

The

^f Ὡςπερ αὐτῆς (ψυχῆς) ἐστὶν ἡ οὐσία, ἐχθρὰ τὴν ἐναντιότητα τῆν τε οὐκ ἐστίν. Phæd. § 41.

The author next considers God as the *first cause*, and argues thus—"The consciousness of my own existence necessarily leads to a *first cause*, which first cause can only be *one*, because two first causes are a contradiction in terms." And this argument is ushered in with the following caution, "I hope I cannot be thought so absurd or so impious, as to imagine that there are more Gods than *one* &c." By which he seems to accuse the orthodox with *absurdity* and *impiety*; and to suppose, that because they maintain a plurality of *Persons* in the *unity* of the essence, they imagine that there are more Gods than *one*; that is, more *Jehovahs* or *self-existent* Beings. But what if this very absurdity and impiety is to be found in that author, who here seems so expressly to declare against it? And this I think, is the true state of the case; for it is his opinion, that the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, are three Beings, absolutely distinct from each other; but at the same time he owns very freely (as we shall see hereafter) that the name *Jehovah* is applied to all of them: and, therefore, according

K 2

to

to the allowed interpretation of that word, which conveys the same sense with *Exod.* iii. 14. I AM THAT I AM, he must hold three *separate self-existent Beings*, which is as flat a contradiction as *three first causes*. To allow that the only name of God which implies *self-existence*, is applied to the *second* and *third* persons of the *Trinity*; and then to argue that they are not *coeternal* with the *first*; if it was not wicked, would in a learned man be an unpardonable blunder.

Now we are upon the subject of *self-existence*, it will be proper to note that *Christ* (on more occasions than one) assumes this undisputed characteristic of essential divinity. *Before Abraham was* (says he) I AM; describing his own existence by the *permanent present*, expressive of that mode of existence, which can only be conceived of the *supreme God* or *first cause*. The comment of *Lucas Brugenfis* upon this expression is—*Non dicit eram, sed SUM, ut notet, constantem ipsius, et immobilem æternitatem*^h.

But

^h See *Pole* in loc.

But as concerning the *first cause*, the author affirms, that “ every thing which exists besides that, which way soever it is brought into being, whether it be *begotten, emanated, created, or 'spoken forth,* it must proceed from, and owe its existence to the WILL as well as power of that first cause.” And to make this appear plausible, he adds, in a note, the opinion of *Athanasius*, who (as he tells us) “ acknowledges it to be impious to say that God the Father was necessitated to act, even when he begat the Son ; and allows also that neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit are the first cause ; but the Father alone, and that the Son and Holy Spirit were both causedⁱ.” How studiously doth he in all this avoid the word *creature* ! though he takes care to express the same thing in other words, as the *Arians* always did : for which reason, *Athanasius* in that very page^k, to part of which the author refers us, thus appeals to his readers—
 “ How manifest is their crafty ambiguity !
 “ for while they are ashamed to call him
 “ (*Christ*) the *work of God*, or a *creature*,
 “ devise

ⁱ *Ibid.*^k Vol. I. p. 512.

“ devise other modes of speech, introdu-
 “ cing the term WILL, and saying, that un-
 “ less he existed by the *will* of God, God
 “ was necessitated to have a Son *against his*
 “ *will*. But (adds he) ye impious men,
 “ which pervert every thing for the sake of
 “ your *heresy*, who pretends to ascribe ne-
 “ cessity to God?” And this is his method
 of *acknowledging it to be impious to say, that*
God the Father was necessitated to act; which
 expression, as it stands together with the
 context, appears in a light extremely diffe-
 rent from what it does in the author’s refe-
 rence to it.

’Tis true, *Athanasius* does speak of the
 Father as a cause, but not in the author’s
 sense of a *first cause*. “ He *begets* the Son
 “ (saith he) and *sends forth* the Spirit, and,
 “ therefore, we call the Father a *cause*¹ ;”
 meaning only that the first person of the Tri-
 nity is a cause, with respect to that office
 he hath taken upon himself in the œconomy
 of man’s redemption; in which sense, he
 is not a natural, but an œconomical cause.
 However, as there is no undoubted war-
 rant

¹ Γεννᾷ μὲν τὸν Υἱόν· ἐκπορεύει δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄχρον καὶ διὰ
 ταῦτο λέγεται ὁ Πατὴρ αἰτία. V. 2. P. 443.

rant of holy scripture for the terms *causa* and *causatus*; I think, indeed, *Athanasius* might as well have spared them, for they tend to no edification, and must, if they fall into bad hands, terminate in presumption.

From page 8 to p. 12. of the *essay*, we have an account of a spiritual power annexed to inanimate matter. I will extract, from this part of his theory, such passages as will enable us to form a judgment of it.—

“ When we see a stone descend to the
 “ ground—the cause of that motion must
 “ be some *spirit* or other—since as *nothing*
 “ *can act where it is not*, that power
 “ whereby any body continues in motion,
 “ is as much the effect of some *concomitant*
 “ *spirit*, as the power which first put it in
 “ motion^m.—“ The tendency of one body
 “ towards another, is from the attractive
 “ force of some spirit, which attractive
 “ power, being in proportion to the quan-
 “ tity of matter, makes the difference of
 “ weight or gravity in bodiesⁿ.—“ Every
 “ particle of active or attractive matter must
 “ be directed in its motions by some *spirit*,
 “ *united*

^m P. 9.

ⁿ P. 10.

“ united to that matter, which may have
 “ just such a quantity of *intellect* commu-
 “ nicated to it by its creator, as will enable
 “ it to perform those functions which are
 “ assigned it, in order to carry on the gene-
 “ ral œconomy of the universe °?” This is
 very old philosophy; for the same *spirit* or
spirits which are here assigned by the author
 as the causes of motion, were in great repute
 with the most ancient heathens; but with
 this difference, they supposed this *spirit* to
 be a *material* or *corporeal* one, endued with
 intelligence; whereas his is nothing but
 mere unembodied intellect, inhering not in
 any material agent, which is the cause of
 motion, but in the moved body itself.

This intelligent spirit, by which we are
 to understand the *æther*, or mixture of air
 and light expanded through the whole solar
 system, is the *Athene*, called by *Athenagoras*
νοερονος δια παντων διανεσα, a mind or intel-
 lect pervading all things: which same *Athe-*
ne or *Minerva*, was no other than the active
 power of the sun's rays, or of the *æther* dif-
 fused every way from his orb, as *Macrobius*
 delivers it from *Porphry*, who affirmed
 that

that *Minerva* was the power of the sun, which (besides its wonderful effects upon inanimate bodies) even communicates prudence and intelligence to the human mind^p. The same thing we learn from *Jamblichus*, concerning the Egyptian deity, *Neith* or *Neithas*, namely, that it was θεου ονομα διηκοντ^Q δι ολη τε κοσμου, the name of a God which pervades all nature. And *Tatian* accuses the Greeks with idolatry, for worshipping—πνευμα δια της υλης διηκον, a SPIRIT which pervades matter^q. But as there is such superabundant evidence to prove that the most ancient heathens assigned the direction of all effects to an ethereal spirit, endued with intelligence; I must not drop the subject, without producing a little more of it. The author of the book *de Diæta* (supposed to be *Hippocrates*, though some think it more ancient) describes this subtile agent under the character of ethereal fire—"Which silently
 " and imperceptibly governs and disposes
 " all nature. In this is life, sense, prudence, the power of increase, motion,
 " diminution, alteration, sleep, vigilance;
 L " and

^p *Saturn*, Lib. I. Ch. 17. ^q *Orat. cont. Græcos*. P 144. Edit, Par.

“ and it doth with an incessant activity di-
 “ rect all things both in the earth and in
 “ the airy regions^r.” The ancient philoso-
 phers, according to *Cicero*, “ divided nature
 “ into two parts, one of which was active
 “ the other passive.” These they subdivided
 into the four elements; of which, *air* and
fire have the power of *moving* and of actu-
 ating, while the others, *earth* and *water*,
 are passive and disposed to receive their im-
 pressions^s. With all this, the *igneus vigor*^t,
 or *spiritus intus alens*^u of *Virgil*, and the in-
 tellectual *spirit* of our author (though, in-
 deed, he does not seem to understand it)
 perfectly agree.

And here, if by the way, I may be per-
 mitted to give my opinion, I cannot but
 think that the heathen sages, bating their
 atheistical compliment of intelligence, talk
 very rationally of this powerful agent the
æther; which, if considered as an inferior
 or *second* cause, under the direction of the
supreme, and pursued in this sense, might,
 perhaps,

^r Πῦρ, ὅπερ πάντων επικρατεῖται, διέπον πάντα κατὰ φύσιν,
 αἰσφον καὶ ὀφεί καὶ ψαυσεῖ· ἐν τοῦτω ψυχῇ, νοῦ, φρονήσις,
 αὐξήσις, κινήσις, μείωσις, διαλλαξίς, ὑπνός, ἐγρε γοργίς· τοῦτο
 πάντα δια πάνθ· κυβερνα, καὶ ταδε καὶ ἐκεῖνα, ἐδεκάτε ἀεγμίζον.
 Lib. 1. Sect. 11.

^s *Acad. Quæst.* Lib. 1. Ch. 6.

^t *Æneid.* 6. 730.

^u *Ibid.* 1. 726.

perhaps, open no unentertaining scene of natural philosophy; or at least serve to dilucidate and explain the hints which *Sir Isaac Newton*^w hath dropt concerning the power and sufficiency of a material cause (described by him as a *subtile medium*, or *æther subtilis*) which hints, as it is observed by his ingenious commentator *Dr. Pemberton*^x, are *worthy of himself*.

We find this *spirit*, and its operations, traced in brief by the author through the whole creation, under the name of *instinct*.
 “ It is by *instinct* (says this philosopher)
 “ that the minutest particles of matter attract
 “ or repel each other: it is by *instinct* that
 “ the flower of the field is directed in throw-
 “ ing forth its leaves and its flowers, and
 “ forming its fruit in due season: it is by
 “ *instinct* that the birds of the air build
 “ their nests; and the beasts of the field
 “ provide for themselves and their young.”

This reasoning, when the order of it is inverted, will stand thus—The birds of the air and the beasts of the field (which are *animated* beings) provide for themselves by (what we call) *instinct*; and, therefore,

L 2

the

^w Opt. Qu. 21. ^x *Pemb. View*, Intr. p. 22. ^y P. 23.

the flowers of the field (which are *inanimate*) grow by *instinct*; and, consequently, all *inanimate* matter, *attracts*, and *repels* by *instinct*.

But the operations and effects of this *instinct*, may serve as a key, which will help us to discover what that *agent* really is, that is here disguised under a term never before applied to it. He observes, that it is the same instinct, which enables the beasts, &c. to provide for themselves, and the flower to throw forth its leaves, and form its fruit: therefore this *instinct* is what the heathens called the *soul of the world*, and I find it commented upon nearly in the same words—*Hæc igitur est ANIMÆ MUNDI natura et dignitas—quæ cælo ignes accendit, aera ac mare luce æstuque replet atque attollit, terras ANIMALIBUS PLANTISQUE, fœcundat, tellurem denique alternâ in ævum vice nunc pruinis, nunc FLORIBUS VESTIT*^z, Or if we have a mind to take it from *Macrobius*, it will be still more express—*FLORUM Species hic DEUS (SOL sc.) infeminat, progenerat, fovet, nutrit, maturatque*^a. In like manner according to the true and proper sense

^z Vallin. in Boëth. Lib. 3. p. 144.

^a Sat. L. 1 c. 17.

sense of this affair, we read, in the holy scripture, of the *precious things put forth by the Moon*^b, and of the *tender grass*, which springeth up from the earth, *by clear shining after rain*^c. So that the *author's* account of *instinct*, brings us back again to the *Athene* of *Jamblichus*, and the *virtus solis* of *Porphyry*.

He, moreover, proceeds so far as to think that “ *all created spirits* may owe the limits of their existence, and the extent of their faculties to *matter*: and that the same spirit, which when cloathed with one set of material organs, is only capable of exerting its intelligence in the performing of attraction and repulsion, and when jarring elements meet, &c. breaks forth in thunder, lightning, and earthquakes (*cælo IGNES accendit*) may when united to a different set, of a more delicate contexture, be enabled to *think* and *reason*, and when agitated with anger, to break forth in quarrels, contention, and war^d.”

Hence it will follow, that the soul of a *passionate man*, and the soul of *gunpowder*, are in nature the same; only the one is

cloathed

^b Deut. xxxiii. 14.

^c 2 Sam. xxiii. 4.

^d P. 24, 25.

cloathed with charcoal and sulphur, the other with flesh and blood ; and the same soul that operates in a blast of air, which drives impetuously forward, and throws down every thing which opposes its course, may afterwards operate in the body of a tyrant, and tear up kingdoms by the roots.

But there is another very shocking consequence which will naturally flow from this principle ; for if the same spirit which performs only the offices of attraction and repulsion in inanimate bodies, may, when united to a different set of organs, be capable of thought and reasoning ; then, *vice versâ*, the same spirit, which when united to the body of a man, is capable of *thought* and *reason*, may when that set of organs is dissolved, be united to an inanimate body, and be capable of *exerting its intelligence*, only in the performance of *attraction* and *repulsion* ; which at once destroys the immortality of the soul, introducing us at the same time to the doctrine of *transmigration* in its lowest sense, and to all the jargon of the *Egyptians* about the *revolution of the forms*. But God forbid that any man, who professes himself a *Christian*, should be *spoiled* himself,

himself, and endeavour to *spoil* others, with such detestable *philosophy* and *vain deceit* as this !

How irreligious and unphilosophical is it to talk of *intellect*^e in *thunder* and *lightning* ! when all these natural operations are performed by the mechanical agency of the air or *æther*, under the direction of God ; for so we find them represented in holy writ—קול שחקים נתנו ÆHERES *dederunt vocum*, as *Pigninus* renders it, or, as the *English* version hath it—*The AIR thundered, and THINE arrows* (the shafts of lightning directed by the hand of the Almighty) *went abroad*^f. There is, in this place, no mention of any *spiritual* agency, but that of the *supreme Being* ; nor of any secondary efficients, but the *air* and combustible exhalations ; the former of which is not an intelligent but a mechanical cause ; the latter are materials for it to work upon.

So likewise as to the affair of vegetation ; a plant we perceive will not grow without
the

^e *Cornelius Agrippa* in his *occult Philosophy* mentions *nine* orders of *Devils* ; the sixth of which was called the *powers of the air*, these are very busy in *thunder* and *lightning*, and their prince is called *Mirizim*. See *Le Grand's Body of Phil.* p. 89. fol.

^f *Psal.* lxxvii. 17.

the agency of *air* and *light* (that is, *beat* the necessary effect of fire or light) whereas, if this operation was performed by the active power of any *spirit* residing in the plant, then it should continue to extract its nutriment from the earth in which it is set, and to flourish without the external agency of any mechanical instrument, which is utterly contradicted by experience.

But, to be no longer serious upon such a very odd subject, I shall (for the humour of the thing) allow that there are *spirits* or *intelligencies* residing in all bodies, wherein we discern any active or attractive power; and that we may hear how this philosophy will sound, I shall attempt to account for, in the author's stile, the wonderful effects of the *loadstone*. In the *loadstone* then, there are two poles, one of which *attracts*, the other *repels*; and since a spirit which hath the operation of attraction assigned to it, *always attracts as a necessary agent*^g and that which hath the operation of *repulsion* assigned to it, *always repels*^h, there must in a loadstone be *two spirits*, sitting back to back upon the two poles, one performing its

^g P. 11.

^h *Ibid.*

its office of attraction, and pulling the needle towards it, the other that of repulsion, and driving it off. When the poles are inverted, or the attracting one changed (as it may be) into the repelling and *vice versa*¹; the two spirits have agreed to change places; and when by *fire* or the stroke of an hammer, either a loadstone or magnetic piece of iron loses its attracting and repelling power, the spirits are both of them either burnt out, and expire in a *blue vapour* (as a philosopher once said, who observed this *phænomenon*) or knocked on the head.

He hath likewise philosophised much on the operations, and on the essence of the human soul; but in his reasonings upon the former, he seems greatly to have mistaken the meaning, not only of *Plato*, but also of *St. Paul*. For, having observed, that the human mind is forced to be at the trouble of “ comparing the propositions, which result from the agreement or disagreement of our ideas, in order to arrive at truth : “ hence it is, says he, that *Plato*¹ speaking of human abilities in the investigation of truth, calls it *beholding things in the glass*

M

“ of

¹ In *Phad.*

“ of reason; which he explains by saying,
 “ that as those who contemplate an eclipse
 “ of the sun, *lose the sight of it*, unless they
 “ are so careful as to view its reflection in
 “ water; so the eye of an human spirit is
 “ too weak to find out truth, unless it looks
 “ at it thro’ the medium of reason; which
 “ St. Paul also calls^k, *seeing through a glass*
 “ *darkly*^l.”

Plato does not here discourse about *comparing propositions*, that is, about (λογισμῶν) *reasoning*; but (λογοί) the *reasons* of terrestrial things, or things which *are not*; and informs us, that by attending properly to them, we may thence infer the *reasons* of the (τα-οῦτα) *things which really ARE*, as for example, by observing nature, it appears that no quality can possibly admit its contrary. *Fire*, the essence of which is *heat*, cannot become *cold*, and yet continue to be *fire*; therefore, the soul, the essence of which is *life*, cannot possibly admit its contrary, *death*.

As to the similitude which *Socrates* makes use of, to illustrate this his plan of enquiry, the author hath not rightly understood it. For, says he, “ they who contemplate an
 “ eclipse

^k 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

^l *Essay*, p. 20, 21.

“ eclipse of the sun, *lose sight of it*, unless
 “ they are so careful as to view its reflexion
 “ in water ;” whereas *Plato* has it thus —
 “ unless they view the image of the sun in
 “ water, or some such thing, they *lose* (not
 “ the *sight of the sun*) but their *own eye-*
 “ *sight*,” by gazing attentively upon an ob-
 ject brighter than it can bear^m. That is,
 the mind, by contemplating too closely the
 πα οντα, and endeavouring by its own in-
 ternal energy to behold them as they are in
 themselves, will be dazzled and stupifi-
 ed ; but by having recourse to sensible ob-
 jects, it may there contemplate the images
 of them, without being in the least im-
 paired.

Let us next examine whether *St. Paul*,
 when he speaks of *seeing through a glass*
darkly, hath any view to the *comparing of*
propositions. The *Greek* is, βλεπομεν γαρ
 αρτι δι' εσπλιν εν αινιγματι, τοτε δε προσωπον
 προς προσωπον. Now (in this life) we see
 through a glass (or mirror) by an ænigma ;
 but then face to face. Wherein he certainly
 alludes to the manner in which we are
 obliged to attain to all our knowledge of

M 2 things

^m Διαφθειρονται γαρ που ενιοι τα ομματα, εαν μη εν υδατι
 η εν τινι τοιετω σκοπωνται την εικονα αυτου. Phæd. §. 48.

things spiritual or invisible, that is, by using the creation as a mirror in which to behold them : *for*, as he observes in another place, *the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things which are made*. The whole *natural* world, throughout the sacred oracles, is referred to as a figure of the *spiritual*; instances of which it would be endless to produce : but as my meaning may not be sufficiently clear and explicit without a few, it may readily be remembered, that the *power* and *glory* of *Christ* is set forth in the operations of the visible *light* or *sun*ⁿ—his efficacy in *raising the dead*, by the *dew* which causes the grass to spring forth from the earth^o—the difference between a corruptible and incorruptible body, by earthly substances and the lights of the firmament^p—the efficacy of the *Holy Spirit* in cleansing and purifying the *soul*, by *water* which cleanseth the *body*^q—the hidden manna or invisible *bread of life*, by natural bread, which supports the body, &c. &c. Here are *visibles* substituted

ⁿ Mal. iv. 2. John viii. 12.

^o Is. xxvi. 19.

^p 1 Cor. xv. 38. & seq.

^q John vii. 38, 39. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Tit. iii. 5.

stituted all the way instead of *invisibles* ; because as all our ideas enter by the senses, it is impossible for us to form any notion of the latter, but by viewing them through the medium of the former.

To represent things spiritual under the figures of things corporeal, is (according to the scripture-usage of the word) to speak by an *ænigma* ; and to attend properly to this method of conveying knowledge, is *to understand a proverb and the interpretation of it, the words of the wise and their (αἰνύματα) riddles or divine allegories* ; wherein one thing obvious to sense is expressed, and another, beyond the reach of sense, intended and understood.

The whole meaning therefore of St. Paul's expression, as I humbly conceive, is this— all spiritual truths are situated as it were above or *behind* us, out of our sight ; while the *glass* of the creation lies *before* us, and therein we see them by a faint reflexion : but in another life, when the soul shall be perfected, and the body glorified, we shall then see them no longer by reflexion, but *face to face* ; that is, we shall then receive,

not the reflected but the *direct* rays, which issue forth from them.

But we are now going to consider some operations of the soul, infinitely more gross than those of *thinking* and *reasoning*: for, in the author's opinion, " it is the same
" wise agent which operates in the *digestion*
" of our food, and that enables us to put in
" execution the directions of our will."

It is not my province to explain the whole process of *digestion*, &c. nor would the compass of this work admit of the attempt: but, I think, the *Chymists* are pretty generally agreed, that all digestion is performed by the agency of *fire* or *heat*^s; and Dr. Keil, in his excellent little compendium of *anatomy*, accounts for this operation by the force of steam; which amounts to the very same thing: his words are these—" This
" force (that is, of the fluids acting in the
" stomach) is much augmented by the *im-*
" *petus* which the *heat* of the stomach
" gives to the particles of the *fluids*; nor
" does this *heat* promote *digestion* only thus,
" but likewise by rarefying the *air* con-
" tained in the pores of our food, which
" bursts

^s P. 22.

^t See Dr. Friend's Chym. Lect. p. 103.

“bursts its parts afunder.” *Air and fire* are *material* and mechanical agents : whether they are *wise* ones or not, I leave my learned readers to judge for themselves. However, thus much may be said for the author, that in this opinion he doth not stand single, since most of the ancient *Gentile* philosophers are on his side. Their opinions are collected by *Manasseh Ben Israel*—
 “*Hipparchus* thought that the soul was
 “composed of *fire*; *Anaximenes*, *Anaxa-*
 “*goras*, *Diogenes Cynicus*, and *Critias* main-
 “tained, that it was *air*. Others again
 “contended, that it was a mixture of *air*
 “and *fire*, as *Epicurus*. Others affirmed,
 “that it was a *thin spirit* diffused through
 “the whole body, as *Hippocrates Cous.*
 “*Heraclitus Ponticus* said that the soul is
 “*light*.” With some, or with all of these, the author must concur in sentiment, when he refers the operations of the material or *animal spirit* to the essence of the immortal and immaterial, which is altogether distinct from it.

The

¹ *Anat. abridg'd*, p. 41. ² *De Resur. Mort.* lib. I. chap. 8.—the same collection, with several additions to the same purpose, is to be met with in *Macrobius in Somn. Scip.* lib. I. chap. 14.

The *Chevalier Ramsay* is pleased to say, that the *Pythagoreans* “ always distinguished “ between the *understanding* or the *pure* “ *spirit*, and the *animal soul* or *etherial* “ *body*: that they considered the one as the “ source of our *thoughts*, the other as the “ *cause of our motions*.” But I could wish, that this learned man had been a little more express in his evidence for the truth of this distinction. It is, to be sure, highly rational to suppose that there is an *animal soul* or etherial fluid diffused through the body; and this agent bids the fairest for supplying us with an easy and natural solution of *muscular motion*^x: but after what manner the *will* or *intellectual spirit* makes its impressions upon this, so as to cause it to exert its influence, must always remain a secret.

When the *essay-writer* imputes these mechanical operations of the *material spirit*,
to,

^w *Theol. of the ancients*, p. 40, 41.

^x Sir *Isaac Newton* was plainly of this opinion, and has a remarkable passage to our purpose——*Adiungere jam liceret nonnulla de spiritu quodam subtilissimo, cujus vi & actionibus —sensatio omnis excitatur, & membra animalium ad voluntatem moventur, vibrationibus scilicet hujus spiritus ad cerebrum & a cerebro in musculos propagatis.* Princip. Schol. gen. ad fin.

to, what he calls, a *wise agent*, he seeks to confirm his *hypothesis* by this common observation, that “ when the belly is full, the
 “ bones would be at rest ; which (says he)
 “ seems entirely owing to this, that the spi-
 “ rit, being unmolested with human cogi-
 “ tations, and its attendance upon our will,
 “ may be more *at leisure* to pursue those
 “ operations, which are immediately neces-
 “ sary towards our preservation.” So then,
 there are upon this occasion no dull fumes
 which arise from the stomach, and oppress
 the *sensory*: no ; the *spirit* is so much taken
 up with its natural functions of *digestion*,
concoction, *separation*, &c. that it is too busy
 to think or reason. He might have added,
 as a collateral proof, that when a man takes
 physic, and the soul is exercising its *purga-
 tive faculty*, he is then less able to study,
 read, or meditate : which may be easily ac-
 counted for upon his principles ; though
 physicians indeed are so impertinent as to
 say, that such an indisposition is entirely
 owing to a relaxation of the whole frame,
 which forbids any intense application of the
 bodily organs.

N

As

As I have now finished my first chapter, I think it necessary to observe, that this head of the *essay* we have hitherto been upon, is entitled by the author, *The doctrine of the Trinity considered in the light of nature and reason*, because, unless the reader were reminded of it, he might not so readily perceive any connection between that sacred doctrine, and these philosophical speculations.

C H A P. II.

The existence and power of created spirits.

“ I. **T**HERE seems to be no contradiction (says the author) in supposing that God might communicate so much power to one of his own *creatures*, of a more exalted nature than man, as to enable him to *create* inferior beings, and frame a world of his own².” This is introduced, I presume, in order to prepare us for conceiving, that *Christ* may be a *Creator*, and yet notwithstanding this, be himself

² P. 271.

himself a *creature*; which, in effect, was the heresy of *Carpocrates*, who affirmed that angels were the creators of the world^a. But by a *Creator*, the *Christian* world hath always understood a *first cause*: and if there are more *Creators* than one, there are more *first causes* than one. So that the *author* hath hereby entangled himself in a contradiction, which, a while ago, he seemed to hold in the very utmost contempt. And farther, if God may give this power to one creature, because *there is no contradiction in it* (which, by the way, is such a turn of arguing as will run us upon everlasting suppositions) then he may, for the same reason, communicate this power to any or to all of those spirits he hath given being to. So that we are like to have a strange confused multitude of *Creators*, which it must be blasphemy to mention, or even to think of: but I am obliged to take that dirty road the *author* leads me; and if I am not so successful as to turn him out of it, I may possibly prevent others from striking into it.

II. He goes on—"We cannot say, but
"that some spirits may be furnished with

N 2

"bodies

^a Ο δὲ Καρποκράτης Ἀγγέλους τὸν κόσμον δημιουργοὺς εἶναι φησὶ.
Athanas. Orat. II. contr. Arian.

“ bodies of so delicate a texture, that they
 “ may cloathe themselves with light, as it
 “ were with a garment, may make the clouds
 “ their chariot, and walk upon the wings of
 “ the wind ^b.” We have no right to infer
 any such thing from a description, meant
 only of the supreme God: for to Him it is,
 that *the Psalmist* in the preceding verse ad-
 dresses himself—*Bless the Lord* (את יהוה)
O my soul: O LORD my GOD, thou art be-
come exceeding glorious, &c. As the supreme
 God is most indisputably here denominated
 by the word *Jehovah*, it argues a great de-
 gree of presumption in the author to rob
 him of the context, and apply it to *created*
spirits, without being able, or even at-
 tempting, to produce any reason or autho-
 rity for so doing.

III. And again—“ That no worlds, fil-
 “ led with intelligent spirits, were created
 “ till about 6000 years ago; about which
 “ time, both *reason* and *revelation* agree,
 “ that this ball of earth began to *revolve*
 “ about the sun, is a thought unworthy of
 “ a philosopher ^c.” *Reason*, to be sure,
 hath many proofs that the world was creat-
 ed

^b P. 28.^c P. 30.

ed just about 6000 years ago; the first and most striking of which is, that it cannot prove it to have been created at all. For *Aristotle* maintained that it was *eternal*^d; and even though he had received some obscure account of the world's creation by tradition, absolutely rejected it as absurd and incredible: and *Aristotle* is, I think, allowed to have been a perfect master of *reason*. But how doth revelation agree, that this ball of earth began to *revolve* about the sun? If the author can shew where the scripture asserts the revolution of the earth, he hath an opportunity of settling a controversy, which hath long distressed the learned world with regard to the sacred philosophy.

IV. After he has supposed, that a *creature* may be a *Creator*, purely because it is *no contradiction*; he passes on to that rule or dominion over the earth, and the several nations of it, with which he imagines the angels to be invested. In relation to which, he first suits himself with an opinion from the heathens, and then attempts to make the scripture perfectly conformable to it. The *Pagan* notion of this matter, as delivered

^d *Gale's Court of the Gent.* P. II. B. 6. ch. 1.

vered by the *Essay-writer*, is as follows :—

“ *Hesiod*, one of the first *heathen* authors
 “ extant, supposeth myriads of invisible spi-
 “ rits cloathed in air, attending upon this
 “ terrestrial globe, and employed as *angels*,
 “ that is, *messengers*, between the great God
 “ and mankind, observing their actions, and
 “ reporting them to *Jupiter*.” And *Plato*
 says^e, “ that *Saturn* well knowing there was
 “ no man who could have absolute empire
 “ over others, without abandoning himself
 “ to all kinds of violence and injustice, sub-
 “ jected the nations to *dæmons* or *intelligent*
 “ *spirits*, as their lords and governors^f.”

As this gentleman does, for the most part, give a lame and imperfect account of every thing, it will be proper to examine more particularly into the nature of these *dæmons*: this done, it will be very clear, that there neither is, nor can be, any resemblance or similitude between them, and the *ministring spirits* of the true God, mention'd in holy scripture.

Hesiod tells us, that “ the race of men
 “ which lived in peace and security in the
 “ golden age under the reign of *Saturn*,
 “ were,

^e Plato de Leg. lib. 4.

^f P. 32.

“ were, when they died (upon the expiration of that happy age) ordained by the
 “ wise counsel of *Jupiter* to be dæmons,
 “ which go to and fro about the earth
 “ clothed in air, observing the good and
 “ evil actions of men^ε. ” The *dæmons* therefore, or *myriads of invisible spirits* which *Hesiod* supposeth, are nothing more than the *departed souls* of men, cloathed in air : as for their being *angels* or *messengers* between the *great god* (that is, the *heathen Jupiter*) and mankind, he says nothing about it.

But there happens to be a very notable contradiction, as to this affair, between *Plato* and *Hesiod* : the one supposeth these *dæmons* to have been appointed by *Saturn*, that is, during the time of the *golden age* ; because his administration and the *golden age* expired together : the other maintains, that they were ordained by *Jupiter*, who, as it is well known, did not begin his reign, till he had first castrated and dethroned his father *Saturn*.

Another account of these beings, given more at large, is to be found in *Apuleius*, which I shall contract into as small a compass,

^ε Hesiod. *Egy. lib. I. l. 108, &c.*

pass, as can conveniently be done, and set it down. “ There are certain middle powers
 “ (between the *gods* and *men*, that is) which
 “ are divine: these the *Greeks* call *dæmons*,
 “ by whom, as *Plato* supposes, all the mi-
 “ racles of magicians are performed, and
 “ the various signs, such as appear in the
 “ entrails of beasts, the flashings of lightening,
 “ &c. by which we foretel future
 “ events, are regulated; for it is not worth
 “ the while of the *Dii superi* to condescend
 “ to such offices as these. They have bodies
 “ so exactly balanced, that they are neither
 “ too light nor too heavy; for were they
 “ too light, they might mount upwards,
 “ and fly off into the more remote etherial
 “ spaces; were they too heavy, they might
 “ then take the lower road, and be precipitated
 “ into the infernal regions.” The
 argument, made use of by *Apuleius*, to
 prove the existence of these airy *dæmons*,
 is something curious: “ For as there are
 “ animals which inhabit the *earth*, others
 “ which live in *water*, and others again, as
 “ *Aristotle* contends, in *fire*; therefore, argues
 “ he, it is absurd to suppose that the
 “ element of *air* is left desolate, and with-

“ out its proper inhabitants generated in it :
 “ as for birds, they are more properly to
 “ be esteemed terrestrial animals ^h.”

Such is the nature of dæmons, as described by the Heathens, who believed in, and worshipped this tribe, only because they thought the matter of the universe to be eternal, and the *air* (of which according to them the human soul was a part) divine and intelligent. Whether there is any resemblance between these and the *ministring spirits* mentioned in the *holy scripture*, will appear when we consider, that the former depend upon the matter of this system for their existence, and hover continually in the air ; the latter were in being before it, and dwell in the presence of ⁱ God. We should likewise remember the promise of *Christ*, that at the *resurrection* we shall be as the *angels of God which are in heaven* ; and if by *heaven* is meant the *material heaven*, or expanse filled with spirits, then our residence is to be as theirs is, in the *air*, which is every way impossible. For at the last day, *the heavens*, or expanse, (esteemed *divine and intelligent* by its infatuated votaries)

O

^h *Apul. de Deo Socratis*, p. 62, &c.

ⁱ *Rev. xii. 7. Dan. vii. 10.*

taries) *shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burnt up*^k.

V. But we ought to enquire, how the *Heathens* can possibly be qualified to give any evidence worth our notice upon this point? The opinion of the *Essay-writer* is, that “ the *Greeks*, it is certain, and *Plato* “ in particular, borrowed many of their “ theological sentiments from the *Hebrews*; “ among whom this, of a number of invisible spirits attending upon this globe “ of earth, and presiding over states and “ kingdoms, was certainly one ¹.” The infinite disparity between the two accounts of these spirits, as given, on the one hand, by the heathen philosophers, and, on the other, by the scripture, should, I think, seem entirely to preclude any such supposition. But what *Hebrews* does the author here mean? not the modern *Jews*, for they borrowed from the *Greeks*, and corrupted their own theology, by heathen philosophy. If he means the *ancient Hebrews*, they must have been so very ancient, that none of their

sentiments

^k 2 *Pet.* iii. 10.

¹ P. 33.

sentiments are to be found but in the early parts of the scripture - history. For the *Greeks* received most of their knowledge, and indeed all their ancient theology, from the *Phœnicians*; being descended from those *Canaanites* which in the time of *Joshua* inhabited *Asia*, who afterwards were called *Phœnicians*, and spread themselves from *Asia* into *Africa*, and from thence into *Greece*, *Italy*, &c.

Hence came that knowledge which the *Greeks* had of writing or *letters*, from *Cadmus*, as they say, but rather from קדם, CaDoM, the *East*^m, the land of *Canaan*, from whence the *Israelites* had driven them. And this indeed they clearly confess, by calling this *Cadmus* a *Phœnician*, and their letters Φοινικια, the *Phœnician things*ⁿ, as being absolutely of *Phœnician* or oriental origin.

All their theological sentiments of this early date, were certainly derived from the *Canaanites*; and the very highest of them must founder in that idolatry, by adhering to which, the inhabitants of the land of *Canaan*, had filled up the measure of their

O 2

ini-

^m See *Miscel. reflexions* upon Mr. *Squire's* essays.

ⁿ *Chishul's* antiq. Asiat. p. 99. N^o 37, 38.

iniquities, and were destroyed or exterminated by the armies of the living God.

As for any sentiments of *Phœnician* theology, borrowed and picked up by *Plato* in his travels, he himself is not very clear concerning them. He calls them *Phœnician* and *Syrian fables*, and declares that they were *απορητοι*, *unspeakable*, that is, (as the learned *Gale* very judiciously comments) *because he neither understood, nor could express the mind thereof*°. Now these must have been either portions of the pure scripture, or *Jewish* comments upon the scripture—if they were the former, the original of them must be found in the *Bible*; if they were the latter, it is most likely they were impure forgeries; because ever from the *Babylonish* captivity, to the coming of *Christ*, they grew daily more and more ignorant, in proportion as oral tradition prevailed, and the plain word of scripture was thereby corrupted. In either case *Plato* confesses that he did not understand them, and therefore not much can be gather'd from them. As to the affair of *dæmons* or *intelligent spirits*, in particular, *Plato* expresses himself so clearly

° Vol. I. p. 243.

ly upon this, and withal so differently from the scripture, that we may fairly conclude, that this sentiment was *certainly not borrowed* from thence.

However, upon the whole I will confess (and it must be confessed) that some articles in the theology of the Pagans, were originally of *Hebrew*, that is, of *divine* extraction: but then they are so desperately mangled, so altered to the purposes of heathenism, and turned into the channel of idolatry; that to think of truly explaining any mysterious doctrine of the scriptures by these ethnic perversions of it, would be no less absurd, than to search for the true sense of *Virgil*, in *Mr. Cotton's Travestie*.

VI. We now pass on to the scripture itself; from whence the author hath extracted several passages, in proof of this his doctrine, of a “ number of invisible spirits attending
“ upon this globe of earth, and presiding
“ over states and kingdoms:” whether these proofs have any relation to the point in hand, will appear upon an examination of them.

1. The first is, the text of *Deut. xxxii. 8.*
as rendered by the LXX — *When the Most*

High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels of God^p. The words which the LXX have most unaccountably translated by αγγελοι θεου, *angels of God*, are, in the *Hebrew* original, בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, *children of Israel*, with which our author is so fair as to acknowledge, that the rendering of the LXX does not *exactly* agree. I need not therefore descend to any critical examination of this matter, till he can shew us, either that בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל is equivalent to αγγελοι θεου, or that the authority of the LXX is superior to that of the *Hebrew* text.

2. The second is the following passage from the wisdom of *Sirach*—*For in the division of the nations of the whole earth, God set a ruler (or governing angel, says the author) over every people; but Israel is the Lord's portion*^q. In the first place, this is an apocryphal book of scripture, which the church doth not apply to establish any doctrine^r; and in the second place, the original word, which he renders by, *governing angel*, is nothing more than ηγουμενον, *a leader*

^p P. 33, 34, 35.

^q *Essay*, p. 34.—*Ecclus.* xvii. 17.

^r See *Article* VI.

*leader or head of a nation**; and yet, two pages after this, he boldly refers to this metaphrase, as if it were a true and undisputed construction.

3. “ What adds no small weight with him in this affair, is an expression made use of by *St. Paul, Heb. ii. 5.* where, speaking of the second coming of our Saviour, in a state manifestly superior to angels†, he says, *for unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, of which we speak.* Whence it seems to appear, that it was *St. Paul’s* opinion, that this present world had been put in subjection to angels.” No such thing can appear, because, in the last verse of the preceding chapter, *St. Paul* asserts the very contrary, and informs us, that the angels *are all ministering spirits, sent out to minister for*

* *ἡγεμὼν* is used *Gen. xxxvi.* near 50 times by the *LXX* in this sense. And in this very book of *Ecclesiasticus*, the word *ἡγεμὼν* signifies a *master* or *ruler*——not an *angelic* one, because certain moral directions are given him for his behaviour. *Ch. xxxii. 1.* or, as some copies have it, *ch. xxxv.* the title of which is—*περὶ ἡγεμόνων.*

† How comes the author to confess that the state of *Christ* is manifestly superior to angels? for we know of no intellectual beings, but *God, angels, and men*; and as angels are superior to men, and *Christ* superior to both, he must, according to this concession, be *God.* “ *P. 36.*

for them, who shall be heirs of salvation. If therefore all of them, which have any intercourse with the earth, are appointed only to *minister* or *serve*, they are not appointed to rule or have dominion: unless it can be proved, by some unintelligible subtilties, that a person by being *minister'd unto*, is put into subjection; which, I must apprehend to be impossible.

4. “ This opinion is confirmed by St. Jude — for says he, Ἀγγέλους τε τὰς μὴ τηροῦσάντας τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἀρχῆν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, &c. *The angels which kept not their principalities with due care, but neglected their proper provinces, he (God) hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness.*” This is the author’s translation, and he asserts, that the “ *verse ought to be so translated*.” His earnest desire of obscuring the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, leads him into perpetual mistakes; for, a more erroneous translation than this, was surely never offered by any man of learning in the world. 1. He is pleased to render ἀρχῆν, *principalities*, and οἰκητήριον, *provinces*, in the plural, when
the

the original words are both singular; which makes a great difference. 2. The word *αρχη* cannot relate to any principality which the fallen angels once had over the earth, and forfeited by a neglect of their duty; because after their fall, they still preserve their title of *αρχαι*—for, saith St. Paul, *we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, αρχαι* ^x. 3. The words *ιδιον οικνηριον*, cannot signify, *their proper province*, that is, a nation over which an angel had the government, because *οικνηριον* never signifies any thing but an *habitation* or *dwelling-place*; and to render it as the author does, is as unscholar-like a piece of criticism, as if he had asserted, that when *Strabo* calls *Athens* the *σφων οικνηριον*, he means that it was the place, in which *wife men* were governing angels. 4. The dwelling of those angels which St. Jude speaks of, could not have been any nations or provinces upon earth, because the angels which fell, fell from *heaven*—*How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning* ^y! 5. When they were cast down from this their first estate and dwelling,

P

the

^x Eph. vi. 12.^y Isa. xiv. 12.

the earth was not created; for the fall of the angels was a circumstance which must have happened before the world; because, as soon as the world was created, there was a devil ready to tempt and destroy mankind.

So that upon the whole, if he had maintained the very contrary, and asserted, not that angels were degraded from the direction of any provinces upon earth, but that they assumed their proper provinces in consequence of their degradation, he would have been much nearer the truth: for those evil spirits with whom we are in a state of warfare, are called *κοσμοκράτορες* *rulers of this world*²; and the devil himself is called the *prince of this world*. He is also termed the *prince of the power of the air*; and those evil spirits, the ministers of his subtle and destructive wiles, which hover in that element, like active and sharp-sighted birds of prey, are the *Dæmons* the author endeavours to obtrude upon us from the heathens, as beneficent ministers of the Almighty.

5. “ The prophet *Daniel* declares, that
 “ the angel *Gabriel* having touched him and
 “ spoken

² Eph. vi. 12.

“ spoken to him, said, that he was come to
 “ make him understand what should befall
 “ his people in the latter days, and that he
 “ would have come sooner, but that the
 “ prince (or ruling, or governing angel) of
 “ the kingdom of Persia, withstood him one
 “ and twenty days, till Michael one of the
 “ chief princes, or as the Hebrew expresseth
 “ it, the FIRST PRINCE came to help him^a.”

It is wrong to suppose that the prophet *Daniel*, when he speaks (by the information of the angel) concerning the princes of *Persia* and *Græcia*, means (according to the author's metaphrase) governing angels: since it is plain, that he frequently refers to the then condition of those kingdoms, and prophecies concerning the changes of the *Persian* and *Græcian* empires; wherein, amongst the affairs of other princes, he alludes to those of *Alexander* and *Darius Codomannus*^b; so that if the prophecy of *Daniel* be interpreted throughout according to this new plan, the battle of *Arbela* will appear to have been no other than the battle of the angels; we may, therefore, fairly

P 2

give

^a *Essay* p. 45. *Dan.* x. 13. ^b See *Matthiæ Hist.* Quat. Monarch. p. 118, &c. p. 302. &c.

give up all that he hath advanced upon the prophecy of *Daniel*; but before we dismiss it, it will be proper to obviate what he has offered about *Michael, one of the chief princes, or the first prince*: by which, and by another expression in the same prophecy—*MICHAEL the great prince, which standeth for the children of Israel*—he thinks it is intimated that as inferior angels were appointed to rule over other nations, so he was commissioned by God to rule over *Israel*.

He supposes all along that *Michael* is the same person with *Christ*; which I readily grant, and will give my reasons for granting this, though he hath not given his for supposing it. After which (though this subject more properly belongs to my next chapter) it shall be shewn, that *Michael* is not a created angel, and that he had not the direction of *Israel*) as the *author* asserts^c assigned him by the Most High, as the portion of his inheritance.

First then, I am to shew that *Michael* and *Christ* are one and the same person.

There is no evidence, throughout the whole scripture, for a plurality of archangels:

gels: we hear only of one, who is αρχων των αγγελων (for such the word is, when given at length) *the head, or ruler of the angels*, he whom the angels were commanded *to worship*, as being his creatures and servants. And these angels, which in the book of *Revelation*, are called the *angels of Michael*, are likewise said to be the angels of *Christ*; for, *the Son of Man* (as he himself hath assured us) *shall come, in the glory of the Father, with HIS holy angels*^d; and again, *the Son of Man shall send forth*, at the end of the world, *HIS angels*^e. Therefore, as the angels have but *one ruler*, and are said to be the angels of *Michael*, and of the *Son of Man*, it necessarily follows, that *Michael* and the *Son of Man* are one and the same person. The same conclusion will follow, upon a comparison of the two following texts.—*The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, &c.*^f. which voice of the *archangel* is elsewhere said to be *the voice of the Son of Man*—*For the hour is coming, in the*
which,

^d Matt. xvi. 27. ^e *Ibid.* xiii. 41. ^f 1 Thess. iv. 16.

which, all they that are in the graves, shall bear HIS voice, and come forth^g.

And thus is this matter rightly understood by the very learned and pious *John Gregory*, where, speaking of that voice, which shall awake the dead, he says, “nor shall it be
“the voice of a God, and not of a man;
“it shall be an human voice, for by the
“*archangel* we are to mean the *Son of Man*,
“for the hour is coming, &c^h.”

The second proposition I am to make good is, that *Michael* is not a created angel.

The only passage wherein he is mentioned under the character of the *archangel*, is to be found in the epistle of St. *Jude*—v. 9.—*Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not (or was not bold to) bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee.* Now if we turn to the prophecy of *Zechariah*ⁱ, it will appear, that he who spake these words to the devil, as referred to by St. *Jude*, is there expressly characterized as a person of *Jehovah*. And he shewed me, says the prophet, *Joshua*
standing

^g John v. 25, 27, 28.

^h *Postb. Works*, part 2. p. 62.

ⁱ Ch. iii. 12.

standing before the ANGEL OF THE LORD, and Satan *standing at his right hand to resist him,* and the Lord *said unto Satan,* the Lord *rebuke thee;* where the word translated, *the Lord,* is in both places *Jehovah.* As *Michael,* therefore, hath that name applied him, which without all controversy denotes *self-existence,* he cannot be a *created angel.* Nothing but an unreasonable prejudice to mere sounds, can dispose us to think, that because he is described as *the archangel* or *prince of the angelic host,* he is therefore of the number with those Beings, of whom he is the *head and ruler;* since the very same turn of argument will prove that because *God* is called the *king of kings,* or *Christ the prince of the kings of the earth^k,* he is therefore the chief of *earthly monarchs,* and nothing more.

To what hath been said in relation to this second particular, it may farther be added, that the same host of celestial beings are called, not only the angels of *Michael* and of the *Son of Man,* but also the angels of *God the Father^l:* from which intercommunity

^k Rev. i. 5. Ἀρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς.
Luk. xii. 8. Heb. i. 6.

^l Rev. iii. 5.

munity of appropriation I infer (and, I own, I do not see what can invalidate the inference) that as *Michael* and *Christ* appear from hence to be the same person, so it must also appear that *Christ* partakes of the same divine essence with God the Father, and is his co-equal in majesty, power, and dominion.

It is in the next place to be shewn, that *Christ* under the names of *Michael*, *Jehovah*, or the *great prince which standeth for the children of Israel*, had not “the care of that nation assigned to him by the Most High,” as the portion of his inheritance; which proposition is by the *Essay* writer held in the affirmative^m, and a great part of his work rests upon the supposed truth of it.

But if *Christ*, as the guide and protector of the children of *Israel*, was himself the *Most High*, it must carry with it a self-contradiction to say, that he had the care of that people assigned to him, as the portion of his inheritance, by the *Most High*. St. *Paul* observes, that some of the *Israelites* were destroyed in the wilderness, because they tempted CHRISTⁿ, which the divinely inspired

^m See *Essay*, P. 34, 45, 47, 48.

ⁿ 1 Cor. x. 9.

inspired *Psalmist* expresses by saying, that they *tempted the MOST HIGH GOD*°.

And again, it is certain that the kingdom of *Israel*, was not, according to the author's sense of the thing, assigned to *Christ* the second person of the Trinity, as to its guardian angel, because this very same kingdom is also appropriated to the *Holy Spirit* : for the prophet *David* in his *last* prophetic words, thus describes or entitles the divine Person, to whom he owed his inspiration—*The SPIRIT OF THE LORD spake by me—the GOD OF ISRAEL* said, &c.

We have now gone through all the arguments by which this *angelic* system of government, framed purely for the sake of ranking *Christ* with created angels, is supported. The author of them thinks they have given him a sufficient warrant for setting down the following conclusion—"It
 " is manifest, that, according to the scriptures of the Old-testament," (he should have added "and of the New," since two of his arguments out of five are taken from it)
 " angels were appointed to preside over
 " people and nations *upon earth*°." Not quite

° Psal. lxxviii. 56. conf. *Exod.* xvii. 2, 7. P P. 47.

quite so *manifest*, I think, from the foregoing premises, which for our satisfaction we will, by recapitulating, take a short review of. The first is, a version of the LXX, which strongly favours of traditional *Judaism*, and contradicts the *Hebrew* text. 2. A quotation from an *apocryphal* book, wherein the word *ἡγούμενος* is translated, *governing angel*. 3. An expression of St. Paul, relating to the *other world*. 4. The fall of angels *before the world*, alluded to by St. Jude. 5. The mention made of *human princes* by the prophet *Daniel*.

C H A P . III.

His objections against the divinity of Christ answered.

IT is high time for me to inform my reader that I have hitherto omitted to take notice of the *Jewish* evidence, alledged every now and then by the author in support of his opinions; and evidence in plenty he might have collected from *Jewish* writers, if it were possible for his opinions to
be

be ten times worse than they really are. If their testimony were of any avail *against* the truth, Dr. *Middleton* would have stood a much fairer chance than he did, for shewing that the whole *law of Moses* was a mere human fiction, artfully framed by a cunning fellow, well versed in the *wisdom of Egypt*, to keep a superstitious and silly people under proper regulations¹.

Our author “chuses to lay before his
“reader the opinion of the most sensible
“and learned among the *ancient Jews*, as
“he finds it very judiciously collected by
“*Eusebius* bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*,
“who must be allowed to be a tolerable
“judge, because he lived *amongst them* in
“the land of *Judæa*”. What is it, that
we must allow him to be a *tolerable judge*
of? that the opinions he hath collected were
really Jewish? no body denies it. But as
Eusebius did not flourish till towards the
latter end of the third century, when the
Jews had been for three hundred years em-
ployed in evading the true sense of the scrip-
tures, in order to baffle and defeat the fol-

Q 2

lowers

¹ See his quotations from *Josephus* cont. App. and *Philo* de exitu—in his defence of the latter, &c. p. 27, 41. ¹P. 40.

lowers of *Jesus*; how can it be expected that their impure comments should breathe the uncorrupt spirit of christianity? These are the men, whom he gravely dignifies, in his title page, with the appellation of *ancient Hebrews*, that is, *modern Jews*, who had endeavoured to their utmost so to infect that air the Christians were to breathe in, as to breed a pestilence amongst them. Nay, the *author* himself, to the utter ruin of his whole scheme, as far as the *Jews* are concerned in it, confesses that ever “ since the
 “ coming of our Saviour, not being wil-
 “ ling to abide by the expositions given to
 “ the Old-testament, they ran into number-
 “ less absurd contrivances of expounding the
 “ scriptures according to hidden and caba-
 “ listical meanings,” of their own devising*.

But these, he observes, were the *more modern Jews*; that is, to use his own words, all the *Jews* who lived “ since the coming
 “ of our Saviour” were *modern*; and pray then, what sort of *Jews* must those have been, *amongst which* Eusebius lived? for if they commenced *absurd* and *modern* upon *our Saviour’s coming*, how is it possible for
 them

* P. 39, 40.

them to be *sensible* and *ancient*, three hundred years after it? As it appears that the author contradicts himself, I will shew that the *Jews* do the same, and then fairly dismiss them.

At page 41, we find a quotation from *Eusebius*, which extends nearly throughout three pages, the conclusion of which runs thus—" All the *Hebrew* divines, *after* that " God, who is *over all*, and *after* his first-born Wisdom, pay divine worship to the " third and holy power, which they call " the Holy Spirit." But what authority have these *Hebrew* divines for saying, that adoration is to be paid to the first-born Wisdom, AFTER that God who is *over all*; when a little backwarder in the same quotation, they confess, that this first-begotten of the Father *far exceeds all created beings*? The plain alternative is this, he is either a *created being*, or the *self-existent God*; but he cannot be a *created being*, because he *far exceeds all created beings*; if so, divine worship is not to be paid to him *after*, or in subordination to the Father, but upon an equality with him.

Again,

Again, he tells us, that “ the *Jews* made
 “ a *second essence* of the *Logos*, which was
 “ begotten by the *first cause*; and *Philo*
 “ *Judæus* calls the *Logos* (δεύτερος θεός)
 “ a *second God*, in whose image man was
 “ created.” It seems that *all the Hebrew*
divines agree in these matters, and make the
Logos a *secondary God*, one who is to receive
 a sort of divine adoration, inferior to that
 paid to *God, who is over all*. Now, I have
 the authority of a *Jew* for affirming, that
all the Hebrew divines maintain the very
 contrary, and confess that the *Logos*, or se-
 cond person of the Trinity, under another
 name, that of the *redeeming angel*, is strictly
 and properly to be esteemed *the very God*.
 For *rabbi Moses* thus gives his opinion con-
 cerning the divine person, who appeared to
Joshua under an human shape, as *captain*
of the Lord's host: “ This angel,” says the
 above-named *Hebrew* divine, “ is the *An-*
 “ *gel-Redeemer*, who in *Exod.* xxxiii. 14.
 “ is called the *face of God*; but the *face of*
 “ *God* signifies *GOD HIMSELF*, as *ALL IN-*
 “ *TERPRETERS* confess; of this same angel
 “ it

“ it is said, *my name* (the incommunicable
 “ name *Jehovah*) *is in him*.”

As there can be no perfect coincidence between the present *Jewish* plan, and the *Christian*, the only possible use that can be made of their writings is, to extract such parts of them, as contradict the apostate scheme, and to turn their own weapons backward upon themselves; which design hath been admirably well executed by the deeply learned *Raymund Martini*, in his *Pugio Fidei*; who by searching with indefatigable labour into all the combined efforts of this *synagogue of Satan*^w, hath set forth an whole volume of their unguarded concessions, which as oft as they are pointed toward the main body of their detestable fictions, must, like a scorpion striking itself to death with its own sting, give so many mortal wounds to the general strain of their extravagant interpretations.

We know, that in the time of our blessed Saviour, the scribes and lawyers among the
Jews,

^w *Iste angelus est angelus Redemptor, qui est facies Dei. Exod. xxxiii. 14. Atqui facies Dei significat IPSUM DEUM, ut fatentur OMNES interpretes. De hoc dicitur, nomen meum in eo est.—Cited by Fagius, upon Josh. v. 14- ^w Rev. ii. 9. and iii. 9.*

Jews, who ought to have been, men *instructed*, by the sacred oracles, *into the kingdom of God*, had *taken away the key of knowledge*; and it is no where recorded, that from that day to this they ever returned it. Nay, ever from that time forwards, they grew continually worse and worse, as to their knowledge of the holy scripture; which they searched only to pervert; and being instigated by the most infernal malice against *Him*, instead of whom they had desired a murderer to be released unto them, fell into as great a degree of blindness as those men of *Sodom*, who *wearied themselves to find the door* of the house, with the desperate resolution of affronting the divine persons inclosed within it. And though to us, who enter in by *Christ*, the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*, the scripture is clear and open; yet to them it is as fast shut and closed, as that den into which the prophet *Daniel* was cast, with a stone laid upon the mouth of it, and sealed with the signet of heaven: nor hath the *purpose* of the king yet been *changed* concerning them.

Whatever therefore *Philo* and his brethren may have been pleased to utter, about
the

the *second cause*, the *most ancient of angels*, the *guardian of Israel*, and the *archangel subsisting with many names*—away with it all; let it return to the place from whence it came; and as a final answer to the author upon this head, and to caution my reader against that trash of *Judaism*, with which the *Essay on spirit* hath presented us; let me subjoin that earnest injunction of *St. Paul* to *Timothy*, given at a time, when it may reasonably be supposed, that there were many and much more antient writings of this sort extant—GIVE NO HEED TO JEWISH FABLES.

We are now to enter upon the *Essay-writer's* objections against the divinity of *Christ*; most of which, instead of being sound arguments, are misapplied texts of scripture, weak surmises, and groundless assertions; but that my work may be the shorter and the easier, I shall first beg leave to lay before the reader a few propositions, which, I apprehend, no *Christian* will, and no man of learning can, dispute the truth of, desiring only, that as they are very important, he will give them a serious and attentive consideration.

Prop. I. The name יהוה *Jehovah* doth exprefs absolute *self-existence*.

Prop. II. There is but ONE *being* or *essence*, to which this *name* can be applied—*Hear O Israel, Jehovah our God, is ONE JEHOVAH, Deut. vi. 4.* which our *Saviour* himself affirms to be, the very first article of the *first of all the commandments**.

Prop. III. This *name* is applied, *ex concessio*, to *three persons*, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Prop. IV. If so applied, it must denote, that these *three persons* are, after some ineffable manner, really and truly ONE; because, by *Prop. 2.* there is but ONE JEHOVAH.

Prop. V. The fall of mankind was occasioned by an offence against the *supreme God*, not against any *created angel*.

Prop. VI. The salvation of mankind is not to be effected by the union of our nature with *created angels*, but with the *supreme God*.—*God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. 2 Cor. v. 19.*

Prop. VII. We are to be reconciled and united to *him*, by means of *his* union with
the

* *Mark xii. 29.*

the human body of *Christ*.—*There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.*

Having premised thus much, I proceed to the objections :

I. The first of which is borrowed from an *apocryphal* book of scripture—For “ the
“ wise son of *Sirach*, says our author, when
“ speaking of the guardian angel of *Israel*,
“ under the name of *Wisdom*, says, *I came*
“ *out of the mouth of the Most High—He*
“ *that MADE me caused me to rest, and said,*
“ *let thy dwelling be in Jacob, and thine in-*
“ *heritance in Israel. He CREATED me in*
“ *the beginning, before the world, and I*
“ *shall never fail, &c.*”

Upon this he remarks, that this being must be understood to have been made and *created*, in the same sense as the light, when God said, *let there be light, and there was light*; and immediately after this, speaking by a figure of rhetoric, commonly called *tautology*, he says, “ it is *likewise* to be ob-
“ served (as if he had not observed it before)
“ that this angel of *Israel* is here declared
“ to have been a *created being*, in terms as

R 2

plain

“ plain as it is in the power of language to
 “ exprefs.” Very true, fo it is, and we
 would have granted it, without being twice
 told of it: but by what authority does he
 attempt either to eftablifh, or unfettle any
 point of faith, from a book, which with
 good and fufficient reasons, we hold as un-
 canonical? Besides, it muft be noted, that
 the *Wisdom of Sirach*, as we now have it, is
 nothing more than a *Greek* tranflation of an
Hebrew original, in which we have fome
 reason to fuppofe, that the term *created* was
 not to be found, becaufe it is not ufed in that
 paffage of the book of *Proverbs*, of which
 this is a plain imitation, and from whence
 the next objection is drawn.

II. For to the afore-mentioned observa-
 tion, it is immediately added—“ In the
 “ fame kind of ftyle (with the above paffage
 “ from the *fon of Sirach*) it is, that *Solomon*,
 “ fpeaking—in the perfon, and under the
 “ character of *wifdom*, faith, *Jehovah* *pos-*
 “ *seffed me in the beginning of his ways, be-*
 “ *fore his works of old: I was fet up from*
 “ *everlafting, from the beginning, or ever*
 “ *the earth was; when there were no depths,*

“ I WAS BROUGHT FORTH, &c.” The word CREATED was plainly for his purpose, and, therefore, agreeable to his unhandsome and disingenuous method of proceeding, he *first* lays hold of that, and afterwards would have us suppose, that *Solomon* speaking in the same kind of stile, makes a declaration to the very same effect : as if the book of *Proverbs* were an imitation of the *Wisdom of Sirach*, not the *Wisdom of Sirach* an imitation of that.

The *Arians*, in the days of *Athanasius*, laid a great stress upon this passage, in a manner putting the success of their whole cause upon the issue of it. They borrowed their sense of it from the *Septuagint*, which renders the words, יהוה קנני, *The Lord created me* ; and descanted upon the word *created*, with as much confidence, as our author does upon the same word, borrowed from the *son of Sirach*^a : whereas the passage, when read in the original *Hebrew*, or in the *English* version, which rightly translates it, loses all its force, and becomes incapable of such an application.

But

^z P. 52. Prov. viii. 22, &c.

^a The words of *Cornelius a Lapide* upon this occasion are—Hic locus erat *Achilles Arianorum*, quo Christum creaturam esse probarunt, quia hic ò dicunt, Deus *ἐτίθεε* με, *creavit me*.

But the Primitive Fathers, in order to clear up the whole, did not understand this of the divinity, but of the *humanity* of *Christ*, which they supposed to be here spoken of, in the same kind of stile; as where he is said to be *the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*: to this purpose *Athanasius* instructs us, that *Solomon* “ doth not say, *he created me before his* “ *works*, that we should receive it as spoken “ of the divinity of the *Logos*; since it was “ the God-man, who (as man) was created “ *the beginning* ^b *of his ways*, whom he “ afterwards manifested to us for our salvation.” The same is declared by *Ephraïmus*, vol. I. 748. And *Pole* upon this place, referring to *Salmazar*, who has collected their opinions, tells us, that the Fathers unanimously applied this passage to the humanity, or human soul of the *Messiah*. The most ancient of the *Jews* likewise, after their manner of expressing the thing, held that the *soul of the Messiah* was created

^b The original is not *בראשית*, *in the beginning*, as our *English* version supposes it to be, but *ראשית*, *the beginning*. See what *St. Jerom* says upon the words *ראשית* and *αρχη*, in his comment on the 7th verse of *Psal. xl.* (in him the xxxixth.) Vol. III. p. 130. Ed. *Par.*

created before the world : and what is very remarkable, in that little short prologue, which is set down before the description *Wisdom* gives of herself in the book of *Ecclesiasticus*, it is said, *Wisdom shall praise HERSELF* (as *we* render it) but the *Greek* is *ψυχὴν αὐτῆς*, *her SOUL*. To this, it may be added, that most of the ancient theological writers, in strict agreement with the holy scriptures themselves, have determined, that Christ appeared as *man* to the patriarchs and prophets, long before his incarnation.

III. I have laboured hard to give the form of an argument to the next objection, but find the difficulty insurmountable. “ *Philo Judæus*,” it seems, “ observes that “ the *archangel with many names*, was also “ called by the *name of God* :” and then the author proceeds to shew from many places of scripture, “ that the angel which “ acted as a guardian-angel to the seed of “ *Abraham*, and presided over the children “ of *Israel*, is called *Jehovah*.” From whence, he would conclude, I presume, that the name *Jehovah* is applied to a creat-
ed

ed angel. But in all this, I cannot for my life discover where his *medium* of proof lies; *Philo* says, that the *archangel* with many names is called by the *name of God*—we find that the angel, which presided over the children of *Israel*, is called *Jehovah*—and therefore—nothing ! absolutely nothing ! for when these premises are laid together and compared, they cannot possibly supply us with any conclusion in the world.

As for the instances the *author* has offered from the Old Testament, in order to shew, that the same person, who is said to be the *angel of Jehovah*, is likewise mentioned under the direct name of *Jehovah*; before these can be of any service to him, there are two very important questions to be settled : the first is, whether the word *angel*, as used in the scripture, must in all cases signify a *created being* ? The second is, whether the name *Jehovah*, which denotes *self-existence*, can be applied to such a being ? If both of these questions were determined in the affirmative, he would then have instanced something to the purpose ; but to beg them both, and proceed to his instances, without clearing a passage to them,

is a small oversight in one, who thinks himself authorized by the peculiar strength of his reasonings, to triumph over the *unthinking herd*, for running head-long into indefensible opinions, merely because their fathers did so before them.

I shall therefore not trouble either myself or my reader with the tedious labour of setting all these misapplied instances in their proper light; but observe only, that the word *angel*, as signifying literally ^d, *one that is sent*, may, and must be applied to the Second and Third Persons of the ever blessed Trinity; because, according to those offices of *redemption* and *sanctification*, they have mercifully condescended to take upon them in the œconomy of grace, they are both said to be *sent* by the Father ^e.

IV. The next objection is taken from that declaration of *Jehovah* to *Moses*, wherein it is asserted, that the *face of Jehovah* could not be *seen*, because, said he, *there shall no man see me and live*. But yet at the same time we are told that *Jehovah* made *all his goodness to pass before Moses*, and permitted him to behold his *back-parts*,

^d מלאך.

S

יחזק,

^e John v. 23.—xiv. 26.

יְהוָה, which the *author* renders, *what followed him*. From whence he argues, that there must have been *two Jehovahs*, that is, a *visible Jehovah* following the *invisible*^f. But since, as the fact stands recorded, it is not said that *Moses saw* the face of any *Jehovah*; and as it is not possible that there should be two *Jehovahs*, the one distinct from the other, unless the first article of the first of all the commandments is a self-contradiction; I pass this over without any farther notice. See Prop. 1. 4.

V. The fifth objection presents us once more with the same impossibility, the existence of two *Jehovahs*. For the author sets down the following passage from the Prophet *Zechariah*—*Sing and rejoice, O daughters of Zion; for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith Jehovah*—*and thou shalt know that the Jehovah of Hosts hath sent me unto thee*^g: and then observes, that “the *Jehovah of Zion* is
“ plainly distinguished from the *Jehovah of*
“ *Hosts*, and acknowledgeth himself to be
“ sent by him^h.” It proves, on the contrary, that the *sender* and the *sent*, are essentially

^f *Ess.* p. 60, 61. *Exod.* xxiii. 19, &c.

^g *Zech.* ii. 10, 11.

^h *P.* 65.

entially one. Nor is the *Jehovah of Zion* distinguished from the *Jehovah of Hosts*; because, the very person, whom the author here supposes to be distinguished from the *supreme Jehovah*, or God the Father, by the former name, is also expressly dignified with the latter. For, saith the Prophet *Isaiab*, mine eyes have SEEN the King, the JEHOVAH OF HOSTS¹, which when compared with *John xii. 41.* settles the point: *These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory (the glory of Christ) and spake of him.*

VI. The sixth is not an objection, but a demonstration against himself; and I cannot conceive how he came to start it: for, taking it as granted that there are two *Jehovahs*, a superior and an inferior, he is pleased to observe hereupon, “ that this
 “ *Jehovah of Zion* (whom I have just
 “ proved to be the *supreme God*) does not
 “ always declare himself to be deputed,
 “ but actually and literally speaks in his
 “ own name, and calls himself *Jehovah*,
 “ and saith, *I am the God of Abraham*;
 “ and, *I am the God of Bethel*; and, I
 S 2 “ brought

¹ Isa. vi. 5.

“ brought thee out of the land of Egypt, &c.
 “ and positively prohibits *Moses* and the
 “ children of *Israel* from worshipping any
 “ other God but himself: *thou*, says he,
 “ shalt have no other Gods before me: there-
 “ by seeming to forbid even the worship
 “ of the supreme *Jehovah*, the *Jehovah* of
 “ *Hoshs* ^k.” That is, in other words—
 when the God, who brought the children
 of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, commands them to
 worship him, as the one only object of ado-
 ration, he seems thereby to forbid the wor-
 ship of another God superior to himself.
 No: he thereby forbids the worship of all
 inferior Gods, and asserts that he himself is
 the *supreme*: for the argument, when drawn
 up, will stand thus—The *supreme God* is to
 be worshipped—but no other God, except
 him who brought the children of *Israel* out
 of *Egypt*, is to be worshipped — therefore,
 the God, who brought the children of *Israel*
 out of *Egypt* is the *supreme God*. Here is a
 plain demonstration against him; nor can I
 foresee how it is possible for him to vindi-
 cate this absurd notion, of a *Jehovah* affirm-
 ing himself to be the sole object of worship,
 when

when all the while, he must not be supposed to mean himself, but another *Jehovah*¹. “ It is to be observed, says he, that
 “ the *Hebrews* were far from being explicit
 “ and accurate in their style, but left great
 “ room for the imagination of the reader
 “ to supply and fill up the deficiencies ^m.”
 Never was there a cavil so contemptible, opposed to an argument so important! and it is a lamentable consideration, that the *Holy Ghost* hath not an *accuracy in his style*, sufficient to preserve his readers from falling into idolatry. Besides, we may learn from this observation, that the capital doctrine of the whole scriptures is to be settled, not from what is said, but from what is not; not from the express words of scripture, but from what the *imagination* is to *supply*; which, according to the fancy of every different reader, may supply just what it pleases.

VII.

¹ Liqueet, veteribus *Judæis* nunquam in mentem venisse commentum illud, quod nostro seculo viris quibusdam doctis inter Christianos placuit; nempe eum, qui *Mosi* in rubo & monte *Sinai* apparuit & locutus est, merum fuisse angelum, qui se Deum *Abrahami* appellaret, *Deique nomine* cultum divinum, sibi adhibitum, libenter admitteret. Nimirum absurda nimis, & plane horrenda est illa sententia. *Bulli Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. I. cap. I. §. 11.*

^m P. 66.

VII. I pass therefore on to the next objection, which is a passage from St. Paulⁿ :
 “ For, says this Apostle, *though there be*
 “ *that are called Gods, whether in heaven*
 “ *or in earth (for there be Gods many, and*
 “ *Lords many) yet to us there is but one*
 “ *God, the Father, of whom are all things,*
 “ *and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ,*
 “ *by whom are all things, and we by him.*
 “ That is, there is but one supreme God;
 “ in comparison of whom, there is *none*
 “ *other but he*, and with regard to whom
 “ Jesus the Christ is to be called *Lord*, and
 “ not God °.” In the verse immediately
 preceding those which are here quoted, the
 Apostle gives a clear explanation of his
 meaning, by declaring the very same thing
 in a few words, *we know*, says he, *that an*
idol is nothing in the world, and that there is
no other God but one. After which, in the
 words now before us, he draws a contrast
 more at large, between the belief of *ido-*
laters, and that of *Christians*, opposing the
 one only and true God, to that tribe of ce-
 lestial and terrestrial deities, which by the
 Heathens were *called Gods*, but, in reality,
 were

were nothing in the world. The author imagines, that the Apostle here means to draw a *comparison* between the supreme God, and subordinate angels: for, says he, “ the term of *God* is to be attributed to “ the Son, as when we say, *there be Gods* “ *many.*” But if *we* say it at all, we must say it in the sense St. *Paul* did, and then it will make an *idol* of him, who is *God over all, blessed for evermore.*

It should here be observed, that when the scripture speaks of *one God*, it doth certainly express the *unity* of the blessed Trinity; and the appellation of *the Father*, ascribed to the *one God*, upon which he lays so great a stress, doth not here mean the *person* of the *Father* in severance from the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, but denotes, as it does in many other places of the scripture, the fulness of the Godhead, or that essence, to an union with which, the *manhood* of *Christ* was exalted. Which is well observed by *Athanasius*, who affirms, that *the Father* is frequently taken for the *fulness of the Godhead*, which dwelt in the body of *Christ*, and is therefore called *his God*, θεος τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. And certain it is, that there are

many passages of scripture, which demand such an explanation : of which sort is — *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*^p; and again—*For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he GIVEN to the Son to have life in himself.* That is, as *Jehovah* hath life essential in himself, so hath he given to the *man Christ Jesus* a communication of the same life, by uniting him to the *essence* of the Godhead.

But he carries on this objection in such a manner, that I shall be able to turn his own artillery upon him. For this “ God the “ Father, says he, *St. Paul* characterizes as “ that God, who is *the blessed and ONLY “ Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord “ of Lords, WHO ONLY hath immortality, “ dwelling in the light which no man can “ approach unto, WHOM NO MAN HATH “ SEEN, OR CAN SEE*^q.” This he allows to be a description of the *one* only and *supreme* God ; but, it is a description of *Christ*. This is evident, first, from the context ; which, when the connection is preserved, runs thus—*Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord*

^p Eph i. 3.

^q Ibid. 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.

Lord Jesus Christ, which he (the Lord Jesus Christ himself) shall shew, who (Christ) is the blessed and only Potentate, &c. Secondly, because the *appearing of Christ*, here spoken of, *Christ* himself through the power of the Godhead in him is to manifest at the end of the world; just as it is said of him after his resurrection, *on this wise SHEWED HE HIMSELF* ^r. But thirdly and chiefly, because *Christ* is dignified with all those very attributes, which are here ascribed to the supreme God; and we may take all the articles separately, and find parallels to them throughout. First, *who is the blessed and only Potentate*—so of *Christ* it is elsewhere said, that he *is the head of all principality and power* ^s. 2. *The King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*—so—he *hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS* ^t. 3. *Who only hath immortality*—so—in him was LIFE ^u. 4. *Who dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto*—so—the city (the heavenly Jerusalem) *had no need of the sun, for the glory of God did lighten it, and THE LAMB IS THE LIGHT THEREOF* ^w.

T

I

^r John xxi. 1.^s Col. ii. 10.^t Rev.^u John i. 4.^w Rev xxi. 23.

I need not run this parallel through the last article, the *invisibilty* of the Godhead, because it is to be considered in a different capacity, as it furnishes the author with his next objection.

VIII. For, as concerning “ the one, only, “ invisible God,” he affirms very roundly, “ that he cannot POSSIBLY be the same “ with that God, who *was manifested in “ the flesh* *.” But by this manifestation, none have ever been so weak as to imagine, that the *Godhead* became *visible*, any farther than by its immediate union with that *flesh*, which *was* visible: for when *Christ* became incarnate, though we did not see *God*, yet we *saw* the *person who was God*.

Without insisting afresh upon that description of *the Father*, (as he will have it) or, *one, only, invisible God*, which I have just now proved applicable to *Christ*; I shall set down two expressions, which at once must silence all cavils and disputes: for *Christ* affirms of the unbelieving *Jews*, that *they had both SEEN and hated, both him and his FATHER* †: and again he says to one of his

* P. 88. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

† John xv. 24.

his disciples—*He that hath seen me, hath SEEN THE FATHER*².

IX. His next argument runs through 16 of his *sections*^a, in which he hath collected many texts wherein *Christ* is mentioned, as receiving power from God—being *anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows* (mankind) being *made* Lord and *Christ*—raised from the dead—exalted to the right hand of God, &c. all of which relate to the human nature, and cannot possibly afford any evidence for the inferiority of the divine. And let it here be recollected, that the salvation of mankind does not depend upon the exaltation of a God, or of any other being, but of man only, who fell from God by sin, and through the *man Christ Jesus*, is re-united to him. It must be observed though, that four of the above sections begin with, *and as the Jews*, in which we are obliged with a repetition of that Rabbinical evidence, which hath already received its answer, at the beginning of this chapter.

X. “ To declare the *Father* and the *Son* “ to be *co-equal* and *co-eternal*, is by no

T 2

“ means

² John xiv. 9.

^a From p. 89, to 106.

“ means consistent with the relation that
 “ there is between father and son^b.” With
 that relation, as it subsists among *men*, it is
 not: but this is no reason, why it should
 not be so with *God*; or even, that in all
 created beings it should be an inconsistency.
 As for example—*Light* is the offspring of
fire, and yet *co-eval* with it; for it is im-
 possible to conceive a time, when the sun
 existed without emitting light; and were
 the sun eternal, light would be co-eternal
 with it: as was very judiciously observed by
 Mr. *Leslie*^c to the *Unitarians*, many years
 ago, and it is not answered yet.

XI. “ If the substance of the Father be
 “ the same undivided substance with the
 “ Son, and the substance of the Son be-
 “ came incarnate, then it will follow that
 “ the substance of the Father became in-
 “ carnate also^d.” If he had used the word
person instead of *substance*, there would have
 been no difficulty in this: but purely to
 raise the difficulty, and perplex us with
 wrong terms, he considers God as united to
 man, in that respect only, in which God is
 but

^b P. 141.

^c Theolog. works, fol. vol. I. p. 227.

^d P. 148.

but ONE; not as the scripture and the church does, in that respect in which he is THREE.

XII. The last objection I shall take notice of, is drawn from the hypostatical union of the two natures in the person of *Christ*, and is as follows—" If this proposition, says he, be taken for granted, which may be found *totidem verbis* in the *Athanasian* creed, that *as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ*; and if this other proposition be allowed, which is to be found as explicitly in the scriptures, that this one *Christ* suffered for the sins of mankind; then it must follow, of consequence, that *Christ* suffered in his *godhead*, as well as his humanity; since otherwise, it would have been the *man Jesus*, and not *Jesus the Messiah*, or *Christ*, that suffered for the sins of men^s."

Hitherto he hath objected as an *Arian*, and talked about the *most antient of angels*, &c. but now, he is changed on a sudden into the character of a *Socinian*: for this very argument hath ever been advanced and

I

insisted

insisted upon by them, to prove that *Christ* was nothing more than a mere man; because, say they, if God became an individual person with man, God must have *suffered*; which it is not possible for him to do. In answer to this, I must recommend to his consideration the two following texts; and if he can, either under the character of an *Arian*, or a *Socinian*, get clear of them, he may proceed with his objection; till he does this, he cannot be qualified to it.—*Herein is the love of GOD, that HE LAID DOWN HIS LIFE for us.* And again—*The church, which GOD hath purchased with HIS OWN BLOOD.* It is incumbent upon him therefore, if he believes the divine authority of the holy scriptures, to shew us, that these passages do not prove, that the *person*, who suffered for us upon the cross *as man*, was *God* as well as man^h.

^h N. B. These three last objections are intermixed with his remarks upon the creeds.

C H A P. IV.

Objections to the divinity of the Holy Ghost answered.

“ I. **T**HE Holy Spirit must be an intelligent agent, separate and distinct from God, because he is said to be *sent* by him: for it is manifest that God cannot *send* himself; because those terms imply a contradictionⁱ.” It hath already been proved^k, that the *sender* and the *sent* may be essentially one; and as for the supposed *contradiction* of God’s *sending himself*, it arises merely from his begging of the question, that there is but one *person* in the divine essence; but the scripture shews that there are *three*, which takes the contradiction away.

II. His next objection is an inference drawn from the following expression — *Jehovah and his Spirit*^l, as if, by the usage of the particle *and*, it must necessarily follow, that they are separate and distinct beings. But neither will this observation hold
any

ⁱ P. 78.^k See the preceding chapter, Sect. 5.^l Ibid.—Isa. xlviii. 16.

any more than the former ; for *Christ* thus expresses himself—*I AND my Father are ONE* ; where, though the particle *and* may seem to disjoin the Father from the Son, yet the whole sentence expressly asserts their union : and St. *John*, speaking of the whole three persons, calls them *the Father, the Word, AND the Holy Ghost*, and yet adds—*and these three are ONE*. So likewise, when our Lord commanded his disciples to baptize *in the name of the Father, AND of the Son, AND of the Holy Ghost^m*, though he inserts the particle *and*, upon which the author grounds his argument, yet he withal expresses the *unity* of the Trinity : for tho' *three persons* are mentioned, he bids them not baptize in the *names*, but (*εις το ονομα*) in *THE NAME* ; upon which the excellent Bp. *Andrews* thus comments——“ If we
 “ will stay yet, but a little, at our baptism,
 “ and hearken well ; as we hear that the
 “ Holy Ghost is God, so shall we that he
 “ is God *in Unity*. For there we hear but,
 “ *in nomine*, but of *one name*. Now as the
 “ *Apostle* reasoneth (Gal. iii. 16.) *Abrahæ*
 “ *dictæ sunt promissiones & semini ejus. Non*
 “ *dicit*

^m Matt. xxviii. 19.

“ *dicit seminibus, quasi in multis; sed, tan-*
 “ *quam in uno, semini ejus.* To *Abraham*;
 “ and his *seed*, were the promises made;
 “ he saith not to the *seeds* as of many, but
 “ to his *seed*, as of one. So we are bapti-
 “ zed, *non in nominibus, quasi multis; sed*
 “ *in nomine, quasi uno*; not in the names,
 “ as of many, but in *the name*, as of one:
 “ *one name*, and one nature or essence.
 “ *Unum sumus* (saith *Christ*) of two of them:
 “ *unum sunt* saith *St. John* of all three;
 “ this we hear thereⁿ.”

III. “ In the books of *Judges* and *Samuel*, it is not said, that it was *Jehovah*,
 “ but the *Spirit of Jehovah*, which came
 “ upon *Othniel*, and *Gideon*, and *Jephtha*,
 “ and *Sampson*, and *Saul*, and *David*, to
 “ assist them in the government of *Israel*,
 “ and the execution of their office^o.” The
 last objection was built upon a particle of
three letters; that now before us, hath no-
 thing more to rest upon, than the slender
 foundation of *two*; for he affirms, it is not
 said, that it was *Jehovah* himself, but the
Spirit of Jehovah, which inspired and actu-
 U ated

ⁿ *Sermons* P. 642. ^o *Ibid.* See *Judg.* iii. 10.—vi. 34.
 —ix. 29.—xiii. 25. & *Sam.* x. 6.—xvi. 13.

ated the illustrious persons above-mentioned. But the very first instance he refers us to for a proof of this assertion, shews us, on the contrary, that the same person, who is said to be the *Spirit of Jehovah*, is likewise mentioned under the direct name of *Jehovah* himself, which the *author* is pleased to affirm he is not. For of *Othniel* it is said, that *the SPIRIT OF JEHOVAH came upon him, and he judged Israel, and went out to war; and JEHOVAH (the same spirit, which enabled him to go out to war) delivered the king of Mesopotamia into his hand.* In like manner, the *Spirit of Jehovah* is asserted to be very *God*, in the passage he refers to concerning *Saul*; for the prophecy of *Samuel* with relation to this matter, is thus worded—*The SPIRIT of JEHOVAH will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man: and let it be, when these signs are come unto thee, that thou do as occasion shall serve, for GOD is (or will be) with thee.*

IV. “ *St. John* plainly calleth that *Holy Spirit* by which he was inspired with the “ *book of Revelations*, an *angel*: for this “ *revelation* was signified to *St. John* by an
“ *angel*

“ angel sent from *Christ*; and yet through
 “ the whole book he calls this revelation
 “ the dictates of *the Spirit*. *He that hath*
 “ *an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith*
 “ *unto the churches*^p.” In this we have a
 grand specimen of the author’s talent in ex-
 plaining the scripture; for the words here
 set down, were not spoken by the *angel*, or
 by *St. John*, but by *Christ* himself, from
 among *the seven golden candlesticks*^q. This
 is a sufficient answer; but I cannot leave
 this remark without first admitting it to be
 true, and then tracing a flat contradiction or
 two, which must of necessity follow from
 it. First, if that angel, which signified to
St. John the scenes described in the book of
Revelations, was the *Holy Spirit*; then, as
 it was but one and the same angel of *Jesus*
Christ^r, which, from beginning to end, pre-
 sented all these things before his imagina-
 tion, it follows, that the *Holy Spirit* is not
 to be worshipped; because, when *St. John*
 offered to pay adoration to the angel, which
 signified or shewed to him the things he
 then heard and saw, he was forbid to do it,

U 2

and

^p P. 106. Rev. ii. 7, 11, 17—iii. 6, 13. ^q *Ibid* i. 13—
 18, &c. ^r Chap. i. v. 1. Ch. ult. v. 16.

and at the same time directed to the one only proper object of worship, the supreme God^s. Again, as this angel declared to St. *John* that he was his *fellow-servant*, and of *his brethren the prophets*^t; then, if this angel was the *Holy Spirit*, it must appear, that he is a *fellow-servant* with the prophets which he inspired, that is, bound to SERVE or worship the same God; but—all scripture is given by *inspiration* of GOD^u—and then, if any thing follows, it is, that God is to *worship* himself.

V. “ Although the Virgin *Mary* is positively said to have been *found with child* “ *of the Holy Spirit*, and to have *conceived* “ *of the Holy Spirit*; yet the person sent to “ her from God upon this occasion, calls “ himself an angel, and in particular, *the* “ *angel Gabriel that standeth in the presence* “ *of God*^w.” The angel *Gabriel* was sent from God to forewarn the Virgin of a future efficacy from the *Holy Spirit*, and speaks of the *Holy Spirit* (whom he characterizes as the *Most High*) as of another person; not that he himself was the *Holy Spirit*, as the
author

^s V. 9. ^t *Ibid.* ^u 2 Tim. iii. 16. ^w P. 107—
Matt. i. 18, 20. Luke i. 19, 26.

author imagines, and seems to be so pleased with the discovery, that he thinks it something *very remarkable*.

Now we are upon this subject, I must beg leave to remind him, that *Jesús*, the *holy thing which was born* of the *Virgin Mary*, was called the *Son of God*, because he was begotten of the *Holy Ghost*; which on more accounts than one, deserves his very serious consideration, and he would do well to clear it up. The very same truth may be collected from many other passages of holy writ; but the following instance may be sufficient—*GOD, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the Fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his SON^x: which GOD, who spake in time past by the prophets, and in the latter days by his Son, is by St. Peter called the Holy Ghost: for says he, in old time, holy men of God, the prophets, that is, spake as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST^y.*

From all which, it manifestly appears, as I have already observed, that the whole undivided godhead, is in the scripture frequently

^x Heb. i. 1, 2.

^y 2 Pet. i. 21. conf. Luke i. 68, &c.

quently represented as the *Father* of the *man Jesus*, and that the *Holy Spirit*, which begat him of the Virgin, is the very and supreme God, because the angel *Gabriel* calls *his* power, the *power of the HIGHEST*². Nay, the very *devils* themselves, could with a *loud voice*, call out upon *Jesus* their conqueror, as the *Son of the most HIGH GOD*³; and here the author introduces what he supposes to be a created and subordinate angel *upon this occasion*.

Now we have gone through all the arguments, offered in the *Essay*, with the intent of degrading the Son and Holy Spirit, down to the rank of created beings; it will be proper to enquire, how the writer of it, in allowing them divine worship, can possibly clear himself from the charge of *idolatry*, which the *Arians*, upon their principles, have never yet been able to do? Why, he confesses “that angels, as angels, “ have no right to divine worship or adoration on their own account; but when “ angels are commissioned from God, with “ any degree of power over us” (which they never are, being only *ministring spirits*)

² Luke i. 35.

³ Matt. v. 7.

rits) “ and are sent in his name ; then it
 “ cannot be idolatry to pay them a propor-
 “ tionate degree of adoration ; because such
 “ adoration or worship not being paid them
 “ on their own account, but on account of
 “ the authority which hath been delegated
 “ to them, terminates in the one only and
 “ supreme God ^b.”

Thus the difficulty is solved ! we are not guilty of idolatry in paying divine adoration to *creatures*, because in them we worship *God* ; which is the very excuse *Bartholomew Malam^c* gave for himself, when he knelt down and worshipped *George Fox* the Quaker ; saying, that he did not worship *George Fox* himself, but *the light in George Fox* ; that is, he adored the said *George Fox*, not upon his own account, as *George Fox*, but as one commissioned from God, with a degree of power over us, raised by the irresistible workings of the Spirit, from the state of a mechanick, to that of an inspired preacher, a son of thunder uttering a voice upon Mount Sion, from the four winds, and sent in the name of God. If the learned will pardon me, for mentioning the name of *Cicero*, in
 the

^b P. 82, 83.

^c Leslie Theol. Works Vol. 2. p. 619.

the same page, with that of the most illiterate *George Fox*; I think the compliment he makes *Scipio Africanus* pay to *Publius*, “*scito te deum esse*,” proceeded from a like principle with that above-mentioned: so that *Bartholomew Malam* did nothing more than sing a sober *te deum* to *George Fox*, as the great *Scipio* did to *Publius*, and as the *Essay-writer* would persuade us we may lawfully do to created beings, our fellow-servants. But doth he not perceive, that this method of reasoning will excuse all the *saint* and *angel* worship, professed by the modern and superstitious members of the church of *Rome*, and hitherto so justly renounced by Protestants? For as oft as they are warmly attacked upon this article, their method is, to secure a retreat in the very distinction here advanced by the author, and as oft as confuted, still to insist upon it, that the incense they offer to created beings, ascends through them to the supreme God, and tends to the abundant increase of his honour and glory.

It is, I apprehend, with a retrospect view to this argument, that the author afterwards delivers his opinion, concerning that right

which God himself hath to the worship of his creatures; for the case is stated in such a manner, as seemingly to favour the possibility of a title to adoration in inferior beings. The sentiment is borrowed from Sir *Isaac Newton*, though I would hope that great man never intended to make so bad an use of it, and the whole remark is this —“ The worship which is due from man
 “ to God, is on account of the *dominion* he
 “ hath over him,—So that the Son be-
 “ cometh our *God*, not so much on account
 “ of his having been employed in the crea-
 “ tion, and *that by him God created the*
 “ *worlds*, as because all judgment is com-
 “ mitted to him, this being the great *obli-*
 “ *gation* of all duty^d.”

But, to worship God as the *Creator* of the world, is also to worship him as the supreme ruler of it, for the act of creation, and the right of supremacy, are inseparable. *The earth is the LORD's*, saith the psalmist, *and the fulness thereof, the world, and they that dwell therein*: to which he immediately subjoins the reason, why the LORD hath this dominion over the world and all

X

its

its inhabitants—for (or *because*) *he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods*^e. Were it the *dominion* of God, in severance from his power as Creator, which lays us under the obligation of worship, then St. *Paul*, when he condemned the idolatry of the *Gentiles*, should have stated their crime thus—that they worshipped what had *no dominion*, rather than *him which had*. But he expresses it other-ways, and says, that they worshipped the *creature*, rather than the *Creator*^f, which plainly shews what it is that entitles God to the adoration of mankind; they are his creatures, and therefore they must adore him.

This principle of *dominion*, if it were rested in, would excuse all the abominable idolatry of the *Pagans*, who pay divine adoration to the natural rulers, the sun, moon, stars, &c. which God hath appointed to *rule* over the day, and over the night, because they deemed them to be the *Gods, which GOVERN the world*^g; and the contest between antient believers and unbelievers, always turned upon this point, whe-
ther

^e Ps. xxiv. 1, 2.

^f Rom. i. 25.

^g *Wisdom* xiii. 2.

ther these natural rulers were self-existent, and had power essential in themselves, or whether they derived it from a Creator, who being such, was therefore alone to be worshipped. But there is another capital error in this assertion; for, argues he, “the Son becometh *our God*, because *all judgment is committed unto him*.” Now, as far as all judgment is *committed* to the Son, he is not *our God*; because, as far as all judgment is *committed* to him, he is man; for which reason St. Paul declared to his audience of philosophers at *Athens*, that God will judge the world by that MAN (*εὐαγγελιστὴν*) whom he hath ordained^h: and he is not *our God* by being *man* only, but by being *Emmanuel*, God with us, that is, God incarnate. As far as he is a person of the God-head, he hath judgment essentially in himself, for *vengeance is mine, I will repay*, saith JEHOVAHⁱ. Wherefore, let us turn his arguments which way soever we will, and set them in what light we please, still, every way, nothing but the most complicated error is to be found in them; and, therefore, without pursuing them any

X 2

farther,

^h Acts xvii. 31. ⁱ Rom. xii. 19. from *Deut.* xxxii. 35, 36.

farther, I may obviate them all at once, by subjoining the words of God himself, uttered by the prophet *Isaiab*, in relation to this very article. *Thus saith God the LORD, HE THAT CREATED the heavens, and stretched them out—I am JEHOVAH, that is my name, and my glory will I not GIVE TO ANOTHER, neither my praise to graven images^k. No person, but the one Creator, can have the glory of being called by the name *Jehovah*, or be entitled to any degree of that praise which is due thereupon: and he who is the supreme Creator of the universe, doth here declare, as full as words can express it, that he will not commission any being to receive divine adoration, since this is due only to himself—THOU SHALT WORSHIP THE LORD THY GOD, AND HIM ONLY SHALT THOU SERVE^l.*

* Isa. xlii. 5, 8.

^l Matt. iv. 10.

C H A P. V.

Wherein, the extent and validity of his Conclusion is examined.

HERE we shall have the opportunity of seeing the opinion this gentleman entertains of the merits of his own performance, and the strength of his reasonings, how much his Conclusion amounts to, and how much, according to the plan, upon which he has proceeded, it ought to amount to. I shall first set down the whole, as it stands in his book, then divide it into particular articles, and make a separate reply to each of them. His Conclusion is this ;

“ I apprehend therefore, it is manifestly
 “ shewed in these papers, that, from the
 “ consideration of the nature of spirit, by
 “ the light of reason, it appears, there can
 “ be but one God, that is, one supreme in-
 “ telligent agent ; which one God may,
 “ however, create an infinite series of spi-
 “ ritual agents, in subordination one to an-
 “ other ; some of which may, by an au-
 “ thority communicated to them from the
 “ supreme God, act *as Gods*, with regard
 “ to

“ to those inferior beings, who are com-
 “ mitted to their charge. I apprehend it
 “ likewise appears from the sentiments of
 “ the *Jews*, as well as from the scriptures,
 “ both of the Old and New-testament, that
 “ this is the method of government, which
 “ the Almighty hath been pleased to pursue
 “ in the œconomy of this universe, still re-
 “ serving to himself that incommunicable
 “ quality of *supreme*, which it would be a
 “ contradiction to suppose him divested of,
 “ either with or without his will ; that is,
 “ either by his own consent, or by neces-
 “ sity^m.

A R T I C L E I.

“ I apprehend, therefore, it is manifestly
 “ shewed in these papers, that, from the
 “ consideration of the nature of spirit, by
 “ the light of reason, it appears.” —

A N S W E R.

Nothing, concerning the spiritual or in-
 visible world, can *really* appear by the light
 of unassisted human reason ; which being
natural itself, and having nothing but *na-*
tural things before it, hath no possible
means

means of obtaining any certain knowledge of *things spiritual*. Many things, indeed, may *seem* to appear (as the astronomer said, *videor mihi videre*) when, in truth, they are nothing but the abortive conceptions of a whimsical brain, and have no existence any where else *in rerum naturâ*. One speculative disquisitor may, out of a compliment to the supposed depth of his own imagination, regulate the spiritual world in this manner, and another in that ; while, so long as revelation is out of the question, they can, when called upon, neither support their own system, nor confute that of another person.

For these reasons, therefore, and others before mentioned, it cannot be expected, that, from this topic of argumentation, any thing *real* or worth our notice should *appear* upon the important subject now in hand : and, indeed, to consider any doctrine by the light of nature and reason, when there is that of revelation ready at hand, and professedly giving its assistance, is every whit as imprudent and absurd, as for a man to reject day-light, and an open road to travel in, that he may shew his genius by taking

a solitary walk amongst bogs and pits in the dark, when it is ten to one but he tumbles headlong into the first that lies in his way.

A R T I C L E II.

“ There can be but one God, that is,
“ but one supreme intelligent agent.”

A N S W E R.

None but heathens ever disputed it; was there any occasion then for rummaging the depths of reason, to prove what every Christian must unavoidably grant? or rather, doth he not mean to affirm, that he only, whom we call the *first person* of the Trinity, is the *supreme* God? But if the scripture gives the title of *supreme* to the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* likewise, as I have manifestly shewed that it does, something else must *appear*, which a proper degree of humility in the author would have inclined him to believe upon God's authority, and have saved him the fruitless labour (I wish it was nothing worse) of writing two hundred pages in order to disprove it.

A R T I C L E

A R T I C L E III.

“ Which one God, however, may create
 “ an infinite series of spiritual agents, in
 “ subordination one to another.”

A N S W E R.

True, God may do this; but unless this gentleman has proved, that *Christ* and the *Holy Ghost* are of this number, he has done nothing, but is still in *statu quo*, just where he was when he set out: why did he not say then, *it manifestly appears* that they are *creatures*? for whether it does or no, we are sure, it was his full intent that it should; and his premises, if they are sound and good, prove a great deal more than he hath deemed it proper here to set down in his conclusion.

A R T I C L E IV.

“ Some of which (created spirits) may,
 “ by an authority communicated to them,
 “ from the supreme God, act *as Gods*,
 “ with regard to those inferior beings, who
 “ are committed into their charge.”

A N S W E R.

It ought to have been—“ some of which, may be dignified with the incommunicable name *Jehovah*, declared to be *supreme*, and

Y

adored

adored as *Creators* of the universe; and yet after all, be in reality, not *Gods*, but *creatures*." As for their being a kind of *quasi-dei*, assuming to themselves the honour of self-existence, and suffering divine worship to be paid to them, only because they were *sent in the name of God*, it is absurd and impossible; for a vicegerent or embassador is never honoured with the title of the monarch he represents, or admitted to sit as his equal upon the throne with himⁿ.

ARTICLE V.

" I apprehend it, likewise, appears from
 " the sentiments of the *Jews*, as well as
 " from the scriptures, both of the Old and
 " New-testament, that this is the method
 " of government the Almighty hath been
 " pleased to pursue, in the œconomy of
 " this universe."

ANSWER.

ⁿ Nefas est cogitare, histrioniam aliquando exercuisse angelos, et deum incommunicabile nomen ipsis communicasse, aut talem representationem, in quâ creaturâ omnia, quæ Dei sunt, sibi attribuat. Recte etiam doctissimus Camero: sane, inquit, *patroni clientum personas sæpe induunt; at ne sancto quidem unquam auditum est, ullum legatum, cum principis sui mandata proponit, aliter loqui quam in tertiâ personâ: princeps meus hæc dicit. Cujus rei illustre testimonium habemus apud prophetas, apud quos nimirum solennis formula est, Dicit dominus, &c. Defensio Fid. Necæn. Sect. 1. Cap. 1. § 11.*

A N S W E R.

As for the modern *Jews*, I have shewed that they are not qualified to give their evidence in relation to this or any other point of *Christian* doctrine; and the author himself hath entered a disqualification against them, without fairly offering to reverse it. As for the *method of government*, or angelic system of politics here alluded to, if the reader thinks it worth his while to turn back to the page in which I have summed up the evidence, alledged in support of it, I dare be answerable for his *apprehending* no such thing.

A R T I C L E VI.

“ Still reserving to himself that incommunicable quality of *supreme*, which it would be a contradiction to suppose him divested of, &c.”

A N S W E R.

True, it would be a *contradiction* for the *supreme* to be divested of this his incommunicable quality; but this is nothing to the purpose: for the question still remains untouched, which is, whether the second and third persons of the Trinity, as subsisting in

the *unity* of the supreme essence, and partaking of this incommunicable quality, must thereby divest the Father of it?

Such is this mighty conclusion, to which the gentle reader is led through so many dark and intricate windings; and which by the author of it is thought sufficient to overturn the Liturgy, demolish the Creeds, and make the Bishops and Clergy, which have in faith and truth subscribed to the *Book of Common Prayer*, ashamed of themselves!

C H A P. VI.

His enquiry into the sentiments of the Primitive Fathers of the Christian church considered.

OUR author, having thus summed up his doctrine in brief, as he apprehends it manifestly to appear from his premises, is pleased to assure us, in the next place, that “ if we consult the opinions of
 “ the Fathers upon this subject, for the first
 “ three hundred years after Christ, we shall
 “ find them all universally agreeing in the
 “ afore-

“ afore-mentioned doctrine: as may appear
 “ by consulting *Justin Martyr, Athenagoras,*
 “ *Tatian, Irenæus, the Author of the Re-*
 “ *cognitions, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandri-*
 “ *nus, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dio-*
 “ *nysius of Alexandria, Lactantius, &c.*”

The afore-mentioned doctrine, which we are to find them all universally agreeing in, is, that the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* are neither of them really God, but act only as Gods, and yet are to receive divine adoration from inferior beings. Well; but where are his proofs? they come next, to be sure, because something is to appear, upon consulting the *Fathers*. No; quite another matter: the thing, it seems, is so clear, that
 “ it is *needless* to produce any quotations out
 “ of them, as this point is plainly given up
 “ by three of the most learned persons of
 “ the last age, which are, the judicious
 “ Mr. *Chillingworth*, the learned Bp. *Bull*,
 “ and the discerning Dr. *Cudworth* P.”

How the case really stands with these three divines, shall be considered, after I have laid before the reader a much more powerful reason for that pretended *needless-*
ness,

ness, by which this gentleman would excuse himself from the trouble of quoting ; which is, that all the Fathers he has mentioned, (one only excepted) are universally against his *afore-mentioned doctrine*. But as the extracts I should make from them, would, if set down in their several originals, be calculated only for the satisfaction of the learned, who may as well turn to the books themselves, I may be excused from increasing the bulk of these papers by giving them at length, and shall therefore only refer to the places at the bottom of the page ^a.

And, not to leave my *English* reader quite in the dark, I shall beg leave here to offer one argument, which of itself is sufficient to shew, that all the most early mem-
bers

^a *Just. Mart.* ad Diogn. Epist. Ed. Par. p. 501. *ὑποσχεσθαι*, *ἔσθ.* Resp. ad Orthod. p. 295. *ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ*, *ἔσθ.*—*Athenag.* p. 10. *ἰβιδ.* ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ὁ υἱος, *ἔσθ.*—*Tatian.* Orat. cont. Græc. p. 145. *ἰβιδ.*—*Irenæus.* adv. Hæres. lib. 4. c. 11. *Dominus enim noster*, &c. and lib. 3. c. 8. *ipse enim infectus*, &c.—*Author of the Apost. Const.* lib. 7. c. 42. *Καὶ εἰς Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ*, *ἔσθ.*—*Tertull.* adv. Prax. c. 3. Numerum & dispositionem Trinitatis, *ἔσθ.*—*Clem. Alexand.* Admon. ad Gen. p. 5. and 6. *Νυν δέ*, *ἔσθ.* *Pædag.* l. 1. c. 8. p. 113.—*Origen contr. Cels.* lib. 6. p. 287. *ὅτι γὰρ τοῦ ἀγενήτου*, *ἔσθ.* and *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, as cited in *Jerom.* tom. 9. p. 121. Nunquam utique in Unitate Trinitatis, *ἔσθ.*—*Greg. Thaum.* Ed. Par. p. 1. *Τριῶς τιλεῖται*, *ἔσθ.*—For the opinion of *Dionysius of Alexandria*, see *Aibanasius*, tom. 1. p. 559, *ἔσθ.*

bers of the *Christian* church, were universally against *his doctrine*; and such an argument it is, as both the learned and unlearned must immediately perceive the force of.

Lucian, who lived as early as the days of *Adrian* (that is, about the beginning of the second century, two hundred years before the council of *Nice*) and was initiated into the Christian faith, but afterwards apostatized to Paganism, in one of his dialogues, wherein the interlocutors make it their business to scoff at the Christian religion, puts the following speech into one of their mouths — Ὑψιμεδοντα θεον, μεγαν, αμβροτον, βρα-
νιωνα, υιον Πατρ^Θ, Πνευμα εκ Πατρ^Θ εκπο-
ρευομενον, εν εκ τριων, & εξ εν^Θ τρια. ταυτα
νομζε Ζηνα, τον δε ηγ⁸ θεον. *The almighty
God, great, immortal, and celestial, the Son
of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from
the Father, ONE of THREE, and THREE of
ONE: THESE you must suppose to be Jove,
THIS you must esteem as God. To which
another makes answer, by way of ridicule*
— οκ οίδα γαρ τι λεγεις· εν τρια, & τρια εν¹.
*I don't understand what you mean: one is
three, and three are one!*

This

* *Lucian. Oper. fol. p. 1121.*

This of *Lucian*, though it is but a jeer, yet it is so strongly expressed, as to afford us a direct proof, that the doctrine of the Trinity in perfect Unity, that is, constituting together the one supreme God, was in his time professedly subsisting in the church; for it is not any one particular writer, or two, or three, but the whole body of *Christians*, he here aims at. And therefore, it appears as manifestly, that the doctrine of the Trinity, according to our present sense of it, was then universally professed by the *Christians*, as it does from another expression of the same *Lucian*, that they then universally maintained the *resurrection of the dead*: for he derides them all, as a set of poor senseless wretches (*κακοδαιμονες*, *poor devils*) who deluded themselves with the vain hopes of being made immortal*.

As for Mr. *Chillingworth*, the author favours us with a posthumous letter of his, given in his life, as written by *Des Maiseaux*, p. 51. which is an answer to a friend, who desired to know what judgment might be made of *Arianism*, from the sense of antiquity. If this letter is genuine,

* Πειπεικας γαρ αυτους οι κακοδαιμονες, το μεν ο λον αθανατος εισειδαι. De Mort. Peregr.

nuine, I am sorry for it: but, at the same time, am not in the least influenced by the authority of a great name, where I may with modesty think, that I have a right to judge for myself. And therefore, I must take the liberty to assert, that Mr. *Chillingworth* hath grossly misrepresented the sense of antiquity, at the beginning of his letter; and given, not only an unfair, but an injudicious state of the case, at the end of it; which, in so great and celebrated a writer, is what I cannot account for. He tells his friend, that “ even in *Athanasius* himself, “ the greatest adversary of the (*Arian*) “ doctrine, he may find, that the eighty “ Fathers, which condemned *Samosatenus*, “ affirmed expressly—*that the Son is not of “ the same essence with the Father*. Which “ is to contradict formally the council of “ *Nice*, which decreed *the Son co-essential “ with the Father*.” To each of these sentences, I am obliged to set down an express contradiction: for the eighty Fathers, which condemned *Paul of Samosata*, did not deny that the Son was of the same essence of the Father; neither did they formally contradict the council of *Nice*. This crafty fel-

low, *Paul*, made a wicked use of the word *homoousios*, and by it endeavoured to run the orthodox upon the contradiction of three ουσιας, or essences in the Trinity^t: so that when it is said of these eighty prelates, that they rejected the term *homoousios*, *consubstantial*, we are to understand nothing more, than that they rejected it, because *Samosatenus* had abused and perverted it; since it is plain, that, in other words, they retained that very sense of the Trinity, which by the decree of the *Nicene* council, this term was intended to convey. For in their second synodical epistle, written in regard to this arch-heretic, we find the following words—*Qui autem dicit, confiteri filium Dei esse Deum, non esse aliud quam Duos Deos prædicare, hunc alienum esse ab ecclesiasticâ regula arbitramur*^u. *Whosoever shall say, that to confess the Son of God to be very God, is the same with preaching up two distinct Gods, (as the said Paul did affirm) such an one we esteem to have departed from the established doctrine of the church.* Now to affirm, as they here do, that the Father and the Son are not *two Gods*, is to affirm that they are *one*.

^t *Dionysii Alex. Epist. in Athanas. v. I. p. 919.*

^u Cited by *Petavius*, *Præf. ad Lib. de Trin. ch. 2. §. 1.*

one. But this unity must be either an unity of essence, or an unity of person : an unity of person it cannot be ; therefore it is an unity of essence. And pray, what is this, but the very sense of *homoousios* ? wherefore, Mr. *Chillingworth* (if the letter be really his) hath certainly misrepresented these Fathers ; and it is manifest, that they, and the Bishops of the *Nicene* council, were of one and the same opinion ; though, as occasion required, they may have expressed themselves differently.

But in the conclusion of this letter, he in a manner leaves the *Arians* in possession of the field ; and that for the following reason. “ Whosoever, says he, shall freely
 “ and impartially consider of this thing, and
 “ how, on the other side, the ancient Fathers weapons against the *Arians* are in a
 “ manner only places of scripture, and those
 “ now for the most part discarded as impertinent and unconcluding—he shall not
 “ chuse but confess, or at least be very inclinable to believe, that the doctrine of
 “ *Arius* is either a truth, or at least no
 “ damnable heresy.”

And what *weapons* would Mr. *Chillingworth* have had them use? There can be none so proper, as *the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God*. It was the very weapon *Christ* himself made use of against the devil: and though the *Arians* have, in all ages, done their utmost to turn the edge of it, it is still sharp enough to cut in pieces all the subtilties and stratagems of *satan*; and theirs amongst the rest. I cannot, therefore, be so free and impartial, as to conclude with myself, that the doctrine of *Arius* was no damnable heresy, purely because the weapons of the Fathers against his followers, were in a manner *only* places of scripture. Whether they are, as he calls them, *impertinent* and *unconcluding*, is another question; with which, as this learned man hath not been pleased to mention any of them, we have at present no concern.

We next proceed to Dr. *Cudworth*: and as for him, the *author* tells us, that “ he
 “ does not only give up the Primitive Fa-
 “ thers in their expressions, but also in their
 “ meaning^w.” Of which, and of the quotation made from the said *doctor*, I shall take

^w *Essay*, p. 120.

take no farther notice, than just to subjoin a little short hint, from a scarce and incomparable work of the learned Dr. *Turner* upon mythology, in which we meet with the following stricture upon the *discerning* Dr. *Cudworth*——“ But I wonder how it came
 “ to pass, that the learned writer of the
 “ Intellectual System, who seems at every
 “ turn to be so extravagantly fond of a Tri-
 “ nity (notwithstanding, as I have proved
 “ elsewhere, he hath made it his business
 “ to undermine and overthrow it) should
 “ be able to make it out so fully, that the
 “ *Greeks* and *Romans* had a Trinity, though
 “ *he himself* hath none *.”

The third divine, who has *plainly given up this point*, and allowed that *Arianism* hath the testimony of all the ancient Fathers, is Bishop *Bull*: and the strange fate of this great man, who will for ever deserve the praise of the Christian church, for his most learned and pious defence of its faith, cannot sufficiently be wondered at. It is but a few years since he was, by the learned Mr. *Warburton*, dragged into a defence of
 the

* *Notes on Mythol.*——I cannot refer to the page, because this book was designed only as a preface to a larger work, and is unpagcd.

the *Divine Legation*, and made to affirm (as the new scheme of that ingenious gentleman required) that the doctrine of a future state was not to be found in the law of *Moses*. And here he is again as unhappily introduced by this writer, and falsely represented as giving up the sense of antiquity to the cause of *Arianism*; when in truth, he hath written set pieces, contrary to, and destructive of, the schemes advanced and defended by both these gentlemen. In one, he hath evidently shewed, that *everlasting life was the hope of all good men under the law*^y: in another, he hath reconciled the Fathers of the three first centuries with the *Nicene* faith; and undertook this glorious work, because it was the vain boast of the *Arian* party (as still it is, for they are never to be silenced) that the most ancient Fathers of the church were the original advocates and propagaters of their heresy.

From this very work it is, that the author extracts a passage, wherein it is confessed, that “ almost all the Fathers, who
 “ lived before the council of *Nice*, in their
 “ manner of explaining the article of the
 “ sacred

^y See his *Sermon* upon Ps. ciii. 15, 16.

“ sacred Trinity, sometimes speak otherwise, than the *Catholics* do^z.” But this concession can be of no advantage to an *Arian*; because it hath been the attempt of this most learned man to prove, by a compleat induction of particulars, that although the *Ante-Nicene* and *Catholic* Fathers do sometimes differ in *expression*, yet they differ not in *sentiment*. And the man that is so ignorant as not to know, either that this was his attempt, or that he hath well succeeded in it, can have no right to mention the name of that illustrious prelate; whose memory will ever be dear to those that regard the inestimable truths of the Christian faith, and reverence such as profess them, according to the direction of our blessed Master, in innocence of life, and sanctity of manners. The man that *does* know this, and yet can represent him as giving up a point within the space of three lines, which through the compass of almost three hundred pages he hath endeavoured to carry, must be of the *mendacissimum genus hominum*; a character, which the aforesaid Bishop, for their notorious and repeated forgeries,

^z *Ess.* p. 119, 120. *Def. Fid. Nic.* Sect. 11. c. 9. §. 22.

geries, thought proper to bestow upon the *Arians*.

Before we finish upon this head, it will not be amiss to recollect, that the *author* in his title-page promised an *inquiry into the sentiments of the Primitive Fathers of the church*. And what does he think an *inquiry* to be? Is it something, in which a man never *inquires* at all? for instead of turning to any pertinent expressions in the writings of the Fathers, and obliging his readers with a fair and regular disquisition of them, he rather chuses to borrow a second-hand opinion from those, who for different reasons have turned to them, and made different reports concerning them: having done this, he treats us with an imperfect account of their answers. One says, that the doctrine of *Arius* is no damnable heresy, because the weapons of the Fathers, on the contrary side, were *nothing but places of Scripture*—another, that he discards even the very *meaning* of the Primitive Fathers—and a third, has written a *folio*, to prove the very contrary to what he would make him affirm. And this he is pleased to call (by way of banter to be sure) an *inquiry*
into

into the sentiments of the Primitive Fathers! when, as far as they are concerned, he seems only just to have *inquired* what their *names* were, and then makes a rattle with *Athenagoras*, *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, &c.

C H A P. VII.

His misapplication of the Heathen Trinities.

THIS part of his work is entitled, an *inquiry* into the doctrine of the Trinity, as maintained by the *Egyptians*, *Pythagoreans*, and *Platonists*. His design in making this inquiry, is to point out a subordination of power in the persons of the *Trinity*; that this doctrine, as maintained by the Heathens before the coming of Christ, may confirm his own notion of the *sacred* Trinity. And he is pleased to conjecture, or rather to affirm for truth, that the reason why the *Platonists*, &c. were so ready to embrace the *Christian* religion, was, the close resemblance between the *Pagan* Trinity in general, or the *Platonic* in particular,

and the Trinity as maintained in its pure and genuine sense (with a professed subordination of power in it) by the Primitive *Christians*^a. All of which is *gratis dictum*; for in the first place, it is clear, that the Primitive *Christians*, where they write like themselves, do not allow a subordination of power; and in this he mistakes the *Arians* for the *Christians*, since it is the original *Arian* Trinity, and not the *Christian*^b, that supposes such an inferiority in the persons of the Godhead. It is likewise clear, that the resemblance between the *Platonic* and the Christian Trinity, as sometimes loosely commented upon by the early writers of the church, be it more or less, did not proceed from any natural affinity between them, but from that strange leaven of false philosophy, with which several of the Fathers corrupted the purity of the Christian system.

But, to come nearer to the point, we must insist upon it, that our author should *inquire*, what the Pagans originally *meant* by their Trinities, and endeavour to explain, before he applies; for to *inquire after* them, and *inquire into* them, are two very different

^a P. 122, 123.

Albqn. Ep. ad Afr. Episc.

^b Μαλλον Αρειανοι η Χριστιανοι

temptible obscurity ! This *Egyptian* Trinity I shall transcribe, as the *author* gives it^c; and, with humble submission, try my hand at a literal *English* translation of it: and and though it is one of the dark recesses of Paganism, which cannot be properly searched into without much diligence and attention, more than at present I have either leisure or inclination to bestow upon it, yet I shall beg leave to offer, as they occur to me, a few hints toward an explanation of it, and readily submit them to better judgments for improvement and correction.

Προ των οὔτως οὔτων, και των ολων αρχων
 εστι Θεος εις, πρωτος και περ πρωτος Θεος και
 βασιλευς, ακινητος εν μορατητι της εαυτου ενο-
 τητος μετων, ετε γαρ νοητον αυτω επιπλεκε-
 ται, ετε αλλο τι. Παρεδειγμα δε ιδρυται τε
 αυτε πατρος, αυτογονε, και μονοπατορος.
 Θεος, τε οὔτως αγαθε. Μειζον γαρ τι και πρω-
 τη, και πηγη των παιων, και πυρμαν των
 νοημενων πρωτων ειδων οντων. Απο δε τε
 εντος τεσσε, ο αυταρχης Θεος εαυτον εξελαμψε.
 διο και αυτοπατωρ, και αυταρχης. Αρχη γαρ
 αυτης και Θεος Θεων. Μορας εκ τε εντος, περ
 υσιας,

υσις, και αρχη της υσις· απ' αυτης γαρ η υσις
της και η υπα' διο γαρ νοσηταρχης προσωρορευ-
ται. Αυται μεν εν εισιν αρχαι πρεσβυταται
παντων, ας Ερμης περ των αιθεριων και εμ-
πυριων θεων προσατλει, και των επερανιων.

“ Before all things which really ARE,
“ and before the beginning of all beings,
“ there is one God, prior to the first God
“ and king, remaining immoveable in the
“ solitude of his unity ; for neither intel-
“ lectuality, nor any thing else, is inter-
“ mixt with him. He is the exemplar of
“ himself the Father, the self-begotten God,
“ the only Father, and the truly-good. For
“ he is the greatest and the first, the foun-
“ tain of all things, and the root of all pri-
“ mary existent forms. But from this one,
“ the self-sufficient God shone himself out ;
“ for which reason, he is self-generated and
“ self-sufficient ; for he is the beginning,
“ and the God of Gods : he is unity pro-
“ duced from one ; he is before all essence,
“ and is himself the beginning of essence ;
“ because, from him are entity and essence :
“ wherefore he is called the prince of in-
“ telligence. These, therefore, are the most
ancient

“ ancient principles of all things, under
 “ which, in the third and inferior class,
 “ *Hermes* ranks the ethereal, empyreal, and
 “ celestial deities.”

This, to be sure, if I have been a faithful interpreter, is most infernal jargon: but if the *Egyptian* sages, who drew it up, intended there should be any sense in it, we shall not be likely to discover this sense, by coming prepossessed with *christian* (or, in effect, *unchristian*) prejudices, and vainly imagining that Heathens, who *knew not God*, must have been prepossessed with the same notions: for it is a plain and serviceable rule in interpreting any author, not to bring his sense to him, and father an intention upon him which he never dreamt of; but to take it from his own words, and support it by a comparison with the sentiments of those that professed the same doctrines.

It will also be allowed as indisputable, that the Heathens themselves best knew what was intended by their own *super-intelligible* mysteries: for which reason, I dare not attempt the short inquiry I have proposed, without taking *Macrobius*, who, as

far as I am able to judge, was the most learned of them all, for my guide and director; and then, though the mist is very thick, I have courage enough to hope, that we shall not quite be lost in it. He tells us, that if we would understand the Heathen theology, we must take with us the following admonition—*Cave æstimes, mi Aviene, poetarum gregem cum de diis fabulantur, non ab adytis plerunque philosophiæ semina mutuari* †. “When the poets relate their mysterious fables about the gods, take it generally for granted, that the subject-matter of these mysteries is borrowed from the depths of natural philosophy.” This rule *Macrobius* hath made an excellent use of, in unfolding the mysteries of the *Egyptians*, *Pythagoreans*, and *Platonists*; and if it holds good, it must put us upon searching, not for a spiritual or intellectual, but for a physical Trinity, in that precious stuff I have just now translated.

In pursuance therefore of this plan, we will lay it down, that the first God herein mentioned, is the *chaos* or *first matter*; that the second is *light*, or the *sun*; and the
third

† *Saturn. lib. 1. c. 17.*

third the *soul of the world*, or vivifying spirit diffused from the sun through the whole system of beings, from the stars and planets, down to men, animals, and plants; and I must beg the reader candidly to suspend his judgment till I have run through the whole.

To proceed then,

Before all things which really are, and before the beginning of all beings, there is one God, prior to the first God and King.

This, as I have already observed, is the *chaos* or *first matter*, as it subsisted in a boundless uncreated mass from all eternity, till the *melior natura*^g, its own intellectual efficacy, brought it into order; or as *Sanchoiatho* expresses it, till the *dark air of the chaos fell in love with its own principles*, and caused that mixture, from which all the Gods were generated^h. This same deity, made of right superintelligible, is sometimes called *incomprehensible darkness*, as by *Damascius*—*Μία των όλων αρχη σοφίας αγνωτον*ⁱ, *The only principle of all things, is incomprehensible*

^g *Ovid Met. lib. 1. l. 17.*

^h *Ἡγεσθη το πνευμα των ιδιων αρχων, και γενεο συγκερασις, &c. Euseb. Præp. Evan. Lib. 1. Chap 10.*

ⁱ All I mention of *Damascius*, is taken from a manuscript fragment, referred to by the learned Bishop Cumberland in his remarks upon the hist. of *Sanchoiatho*. See page 28c, &c.

prehensible darknefs; and the *Babylonians*, as the same writer informs us, while they *expressed* divine worship to the other Gods, adored this first and super-existent God, by *passing him over in silence*^k. In the *Orphic* hymns, *Night* is said to be *the begetter of Gods and men*^l; and at other times the Heathens made a perfect *merry Andrew* of this dark deity, the material *chaos*, and called him *Proteus*, which according to the origination of his name (*Πρωτεύς*) is the *first* God, or *first matter*, which originally subsisted under no form, but was capable of assuming any, according to the infinitely various modifications of matter; and hence the poets, agreeable to their custom of borrowing from the *adyta philosophiæ*, tell us so much of his tricks and transformations. That this *Proteus*, or the *first* matter of the *chaos*, is the very same with that Deity, which is here nonsensically styled *the one God*, prior to the *first God and King*, must I apprehend, be evident from a fragment of *Epicharmus*, the most ancient of all the comic poets, wherein it is affirmed that the

B b

Chaos

^k Μίαν των όλων αρχην σιγη παρειται. See also *Plato* de Rep. l. 6. p. 686.

^l Νύκτα θεων γενετρίαν αἰσούμαι, ἥδε καὶ ἀνδρῶν.

Chaos is the *first* of all the Gods—Χαοῦ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ των Θεων; nor is it possible there should be any sense in the phrase of, a *πρωτῷ τε πρώτῳ*, a *prior primo*, a God *before the first*; unless by the first *πρωτῷ*, we understand, the self-existent matter of the *chaos*; by the second the *light* or *sun*, the first and greatest ruler of the world, who was formed out of it.

It is farther said of him, that he “*remains immoveable in the solitude of his unity.*” He filled the boundless extent of space^m, had no room left to move into, and therefore was in a motionless state of universal stability, since it was impossible that he should change places with himself. But he is in another sense more properly esteemed as *immoveable unity*, that is, because out of this first matter all formed substances are derived; and while they (the forms) undergo the perpetual vicissitudes of generation and corruption (or dissolution) that first matter out of which they are framed,

^m Thus *Sanhoniathos* affirms, that the dark air, and turbid matter of the chaos, was for a long time infinite, and had no bounds.—ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι ἀπείρα καὶ διὰ πολλὸν αἰῶνα μὴ εἶναι πέρας. *Ibid.*

med, still keeps steady to its principles, and remains unalterable.

*Omnia mortali mutantur lege Creat-
At manet incolumis MUNDUS suaque omnia
servat ;*

*Quæ nec longa dies auget, minuitve senec-
tus :*

Nec motus puncto currit, cursusque fatigat.

IDEM semper erit, quoniam semper fuit

IDEM ;

*Non alium videre patres, aliumve minores
Aspicient ; DEUS est, qui non mutatur in
ævum.*

Manil. Astron. l. i. v. 515.

The *unity*, immutability, and divinity of this first matter, is a point of very high antiquity ; for it was a principle of *Linus*, that *of the one whole is all things, and that all things constitute the one whole*ⁿ, which is the first and incomprehensible God : and *Dio- genes Laertius* affirms the same of *Musæus*, who maintained, like all the rest, that *all things are made of ONE* (the homogeneous and eternal matter of the universe) *and that*

B b 2

into

ⁿ Ἐν παντὶ δὲ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐκ πάντων τὸ πᾶν ἐστίν. *Stob.*
Eclog. Physic.

into this ONE, they are again all resolved°. And thus also *Plato*, describing the universe, as consisting of first matter, diversified into all the visible *species*, says, that the WHOLE is ONE and MANY^p.

It is added moreover, that *neither intellectuality, nor any thing else is intermixt with him*: that he is the exemplar of himself the Father, the self-begotten God, the only Father, and the truly good.” From all of which, I can understand nothing more, than that matter was self-originated from all eternity without a Creator: whatever else may be intended by it, is abundantly too deep for my capacity. But when it is said, that “he is the greatest and the first, the FOUNTAIN of all things, and the ROOT of all primary existent FORMS;” here, I presume, we have a clear proof, that this first God is nothing more than the formless and universal mass of matter, out of which the forms are derived, as from their fountain, and

° Εξ ἐνὸς τα πάντα γίνεσθαι, καὶ εἰς ταῦτον ἀναλυσθαι. *Diog. Laer. in procem. S. 3.* This capital article of the Egyptian physico-theology was expressed hieroglyphically by the figure of a serpent, in an orbicular posture, with its tail in its mouth; by which, as *Pierius* observes, they meant to signify, *mundum ex seipso ali, et in se revolvī.* *Hierogl. l. 14. p. 102. E.*
^p Πᾶν εἶναι ἐν καὶ πολλὰ. *Plat. in Parmen.*

and from whence they shoot forth, as the stem, branches, and leaves of a tree do from its ROOT. In which very manner, *Jupiter*, as understood to be the one universal God, comprehending all other deities comprehensible and incomprehensible in himself, is described by *Orpheus*,

Ζεὺς πρῶτος γενέτο, Ζεὺς ὑστατός ἀρχικραυνός,
Ζεὺς κεφαλὴ, Ζεὺς μεσοῖα, Διὸς δὲκ παντὶ
τετοκται,

Ζεὺς ΠΥΘΜΗΝ γαίης, τε καὶ ἕραιου ἀστέρων
εντός. Arist. de mundo.

Jupiter is the first and the last, the head, and the midst; OUT OF him all things are fabricated: he is the ROOT of earth, and of the starry heaven. By which it is meant, as I humbly conjecture, that he is the *first*, as having existed in a dark and incomprehensible state, prior to that of the *forms*; the *middle*, as subsisting *under* the forms; and the *last*, as resolved, in the continued round of generation and corruption, into his own first principles again. Much more might be said of this dark first cause; but we will pass on to the second person of this Trinity,

whose origin from the first is set forth in the following terms. *But from this ONE, the self-sufficient God shone himself out; for which reason, he is self-generated and self-sufficient.*" The *light*, which is the second God here spoken of, did, according to the Heathen creed, extricate itself by its own power from the bands of original darkness, and arose from the confused mass of earthy, airy, and watry matter. For it is affirmed by *Hesiod* in his *theogony*, that *Chaos*, the first incomprehensible darkness, begat *Night and Erebus*; that is, the *chaos* turned itself into a male and female power, a sort of *hermaphrodite*, and then begat *æther* or *day-light*^a; who is elsewhere called *Ερως Love* or *Cupid*, which sprang forth with golden wings from the *chaos*, and hatched it. The *Egyptians* worshipped this same God, under the name of *Cneph*^r, and asserted him to be *without beginning*

^a Ἡ τοι μὲν ΠΡΩΤΙΣΤΑ ΧΑΟΣ γένητ'—

Ἐκ Χάος δ' Ἐρεβός τε μελαινα τε Νυξ ἐγενοντο,

Νυκτὶ δ' αὖτ' Αἰθήρ τε καὶ Ἥμερη ἐξεγενοντο,

Οὗς τέκε κυσσαμένη, Ἐρεβὸς Φιλόημι μίγεισιν α.

Theog. l. 116, &c.

^r Which is the *Hebrew* word כנפ CaNePH, a *wing*; and by this name, they meant to intimate the swiftness of the *light* in its progress from the sun, and accordingly they made images of this God, painted of different colours, and *winged*. See *Macrob. Saturn. Lib. 1. Ch. 19.*

beginning and without end^s; and yet *Damascius* confesses that *Asclepiades* makes his *Egyptian Cneph* or *Cmephis*, to be begotten out of *sand and water*, the muddy mixture of the *chaos*; from which it must be altogether clear, that this God, though without beginning and without end, could yet be no *spiritual* principle^t; and if not a spiritual, then a *natural* or *physical* principle, which is the very thing I am contending for.

“ *He is the beginning, and the God of Gods*”] which *Cicero* expresses, by calling the *sun*, the—*dux et moderator luminum reliquorum*^u. “ *Unity produced from one : he was before all essence, and is himself the beginning of essence ; for from him are entity and essence.*”] What the *EN* or *ONE* is, we have seen already ; as for this *μονας* or *unity* which arose from him, *Macrobius* says of it (just as it was said of *Cneph*) that it is *without beginning and without end*. He also affirms, that it is the *mind begotten of the first cause* ; which *mind*, as we learn from another part of his writings, was nothing else but the *sun*^w. And this is still farther confirmed,

^s *Plut.* de *If.* and *Osir.*

^t See *Cumberland's* Remarks, p.

13, p. 281. ^u *Somn. Scip.*

^w In *Somn. Scip.* Lib. 1. Cap. 6. Cap. 20.

confirmed, because the *Affyrians* adored the *sun*, under the very name of *unity*; they called him *Adad*, which is plainly a corruption of the *Hebrew* אַחַד *ACHAD*, and *Macrobius* so explains it; for, says he, *ejus nominis interpretatio, est UNUS*^x.

How he could be *before all essence* and be himself the *beginning of essence*, may, I think, be understood by the help of an ancient *Scholion* upon a verse of *Hesiod*, which supplies us with a very clear distinction between *first matter* and *essence*; according to which, *υλη* *first matter*, is to be considered as an unwrought mass of metal; *εσια* *essence*, as the same mass hammered into form and figure^y. Therefore, the *sun*, as his substance from all eternity made a part of the formless *chaos*, was *before essence*; as receiving a form and figure, upon his self-generation from it, he is the *first essence*, properly so called. The reason why it is added, that *from him are entity and essence*, is plainly this; the Heathens esteemed the light or power of the *sun*, to be the sole efficient cause in the formation of all the substances

^x Sat. lib. i. c. 23. ^y Ὑλη μὲν ἐστὶν ὁ χαλκός, εἰσια δὲ ἡ διαλυπωσις τοῦ χαλκοῦ. See *Dan. Heinsius's* Edit. p. 239. b.

substances in nature: the matter of them they supposed to have been as eternal as himself; but their growth, form, and figure, proceed entirely from his agency, and the *essence* of any thing (as we have already seen) is constituted by its figuration. As intelligence likewise, according to their philosophy, arises from the form or structure of any particular body, and as this structure is owing to the operation of the sun's power, therefore he is (as also for other reasons*) dignified with the attribute of *νοῦταρχης* the "*prince of intelligence.*"—

Thus much for the first and second persons of this *Egyptian Trinity*: as for the third degree of power, it is supported by the whole tribe of *etherial, empyreal, and celestial Gods*, amounting to nothing more than the *dæmons* or divine minds, which animate the stars and planets, and people the wide extent of the airy regions; that is, in short, the intelligent *æther* itself, expanded from the sun's orb, to the extremities of the system.

As *Egypt* was the grand academy of Paganism, and the other Trinities, the *Pythagorean,*

C c

gorean,

* See what I cited at p. 73. from the book *De Diætâ,*

gorean, and *Platonic*, were in all probability borrowed from that we have already considered, it should seem needless to take any particular notice of them; but as it is in some degree necessary to trace this similitude, I shall spend a few words upon each of them.

The first of the two, is given by *Simplicius* in his comment upon *Aristotle*, out of *Moderatus* the *Pythagorean*, and stands thus ^a. Το μὲν πρῶτον ἐν ὑπὲρ τὸ ὄν καὶ πάσαν οὐσίαν ἀποφαίνεται· τὸ δὲ δευτέρον ἐν ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ ὄντως ὄν, καὶ νοητὸν, τὰ εἶδη φησὶν εἶναι· τὸ δὲ τρίτον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ ψυχικόν, μετέχει τῶ ἐνΘ. καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν. *The first one he (i. e. Pythagoras) declares to be above being and essence: the second one, which is existence and intelligence, he says, is THE FORMS: and that the third one, which is animal, partakes of the first one, and of the forms.*

Nothing, in my humble opinion, can (in so small a compass) more compleatly explain the *Hermetic Trinity*, in the very sense I have understood it, than this does. Here is a πρῶτον ἐν, a *first one*, declared superior to all being and *essence*; because, as it hath been remarked above, *being* or *essence* arises

^a *Ess.* p. 125. *Simpl. in Phys. Arist.* fol. 50.

arises from *form*, and first matter is *without form*. For the same reason, the *second one* is called *essence* and *intelligence*; and the very name of, *the forms*, is here applied to him, which surely must put the matter out of dispute. From our author's account of this *second God*, it must evidently appear, that he was either unable, or unwilling to understand what he was about. The original is—Το δευτερον εν, οπερ εστι το οντως εν, και νοητον, τα εδη ψησιν εναι—which he thus translates—"The second one, who " is existence itself, and intelligence, is called IDEA^b." Τα εδη, THE FORMS, in the *plural*, is according to him, IDEA (an image) in the *singular*! which, if compared with the language, and the intent of, the original, is neither sense nor grammar. He was, perhaps, under some private apprehensions, that if he left this multiform Deity in possession of the second place in this *Pythagorean Trinity*, all would be spoiled; because, then no man could be so absurd as to suspect a parallel between a God who is in-

C c 2

finitely

^b P. 126. He is pleased once more to deliver this interpretation at p. 131.

finitely many, and the second person of the sacred Trinity, who is only one.

As for the *τρίτον ἐν*, or *third one*, it does not exactly answer in expression to the *ethereal Gods* above-mentioned, but in sense amounts to the same. It is the *soul of the world*, the *animal spirit* that bestows life, sense, and motion, upon all rational, animal, and vegetable beings: and what this is, we have already seen from many authorities (to which ten times as many more might soon be added) in the first chapter.

The last in order is the *Platonic Trinity*, which, instead of being more refined than the rest, as according to the extravagant opinion some men have conceived of *Plato*, it ought to be, rather seems to clinch the whole, and may, therefore, reasonably encourage us to suppose, that we have hit upon the true explanation of them all. *Plato*, says the author, “ in that treatise which
“ he entitles *Timæus*, is the most copious
“ on this head, and therein he speaks plainly
“ of^e one sempiternal and unoriginated God;
“ which God, says *Plato*, when he reasoned
“ within himself about a future God, made
“ this

^e Το οὐ αἰεὶ, γενεσὶν δὲ οὐκ ἔχον.

“ this universe, and placed this perfectly
 “ happy God which he begat, as the *soul*
 “ *in the middle of it* ^d.” The words *sem-*
piternal and *unoriginated* have a pompous
 sound ; but as we are certain that these phi-
 losophers dignified the first matter of the
 universe with these attributes, they are no-
 thing but mere sounds without either sense
 or meaning ; for whatever noise they make
 with the attributes of *eternity*, *wisdom*,
goodness, *perfection*, and the like ; yet, if
 they bestowed these high appellations upon
 a wrong object, upon that which *by nature*
is not God, the most subtile reasonings in
 the world cannot clear them from the odi-
 ous imputation of having dishonoured that
 God, whom we are told, *they did not like*
to retain in their knowledge ^e. All that can
 be done (or at least all that I have seen)
 upon this occasion, is to presume in a grave
 and solemn strain, that the wise Heathens
 could not be so *absurd* as to over look the
 power of a Creator, and ascribe divine in-
 telligence to the dead elements of the world.
 But this can amount to little or nothing ;
 because, whether they were so absurd or
 not,

^d P. 127.^e Rom. i. 23.

not, is the very question in dispute, and nothing but their own expressions, compared with the character they bear in the sacred writings, must decide it.

But let us descend to a closer examination of *Plato's* words. This *sempiternal* and *un-originated* God, it seems, when he *reasoned within himself about a future God, made this universe*. The formation of the universe, therefore, was necessary to the existence of this *future God*. If to this be added, the residence of this *perfectly happy God*, who was *reasoned about* by the first, it must, I apprehend, at once dispel all farther doubts and difficulties. For when he was begotten, he was placed in this universe, as the *soul in the middle* of it. Now what is it that is placed in the *middle* of the universe, but the *light* in the orb of the *sun*, the first and chief of all the *forms* that emerged from the obscurity of primæval darkness? This is the soul *Plato* speaks of, and accordingly it is confessed by *Heraiscus in Damascius*, that the *sun*, here called the *soul in the middle*, is the *νοῦς νοῦτος* the *intelligent mind* of the world^f. So that this *perfectly happy God* is,

after

^f Bp. Cumb. *Ibid.* p. 282.

after all, nothing greater than the high and mighty *Cneph*, *begotten out of sand and water*. This is sufficient to give us a surfeit of *Plato's* Trinity, and, therefore, any farther account of it would be superfluous. But the *Essay-writer* thinks it “ more for “ his purpose ” to take this Trinity as delivered by *Porphry*, “ who flourished about “ the time when the *consubstantial* doctrine “ of the Trinity began (as he calls it) to “ *make a noise* : ” Which observation, though irreligiously worded, is yet in the main true enough ; so true, that it will at once overturn all he has attempted to build upon it. This *Porphry* was an apostate from the *Christian* to the *Heathen* religion, and in his execrable writings, opposed that truth from which he had deserted, with the most implacable bitterness, even to a degree of madness ; which principle encouraged him to draw up the opinion of *Plato* in the very terms made use of by the primitive Fathers to express the doctrine of the *sacred Trinity* ; and it is plain, that his intent was, impudently to confront the *Christians* with this contemptible scrap of Paganism, dressed
up

up in their own expressions. The words of *Porphyry* are these—*Αχρὲ γὰρ τριῶν υπο-
 στασεων, εφη Πλατων, τὴν τε δευτερεὴν περιελθεῖν
 εἶσιν, &c.* “*Plato said, that the essence of
 God is distinguished into three Hypostases,*”
&c. *Plato* never said any such thing; he
 never thought of defining his confused tri-
 plicity by the terms *ουσια* and *υποστασις* pro-
 perly applied and distinguished: and when
 ornamented with this garb, it makes, I
 think, a much worse appearance than it
 did before, by assuming a character, which
 it neither can, nor ever was intended to
 support. So that *Porphyry*, by his sense of
 the *Platonic* Trinity, instead of betraying
 the weakness of the consubstantial doctrine,
 betrays nothing but his own want of judg-
 ment. He has borrowed the most distin-
 guished terms from the Christians of his
 time, and by an injudicious application of
 them, made that Trinity a consubstantial
 one, which according to its original and
 genuine acceptation, was never designed as
 such.

Upon the whole then, there will be no
 danger in granting, that “it is manifest (as
 “our author asserts) beyond all controversy,

“ that both *Plato* and his disciples held a
 “ kind of essential subordination to have
 “ existed between these Gods^b ;” for the
 argument drawn from a comparison between
 an heathen and the scriptural Trinity is so
 inconsequential, that if he had instanced a
 subordination in fifty more Trinities of the
 like nature, it would not in the least ef-
 fect the sense of this doctrine as maintained
 by believers.

I shall, therefore, pursue this point no
 farther, and ought to beg the reader’s par-
 don, for dwelling so long upon so dry a sub-
 ject ; but as it was pressed into the service of
 heterodoxy, I thought it could not be amiss
 to set this matter in that light, in which the
 Pagans themselves appear to have seen it.
 I am not ignorant, that many learned men
 have put a very different construction upon
 these articles of the heathen theology, and
 have been so hardy as to apprehend without
 the least ceremony, and, I believe, with as
 little authority, that when the ancient phi-
 losophers speak of their Gods and Dæmons,
 they must mean the same as a believer does
 by the true God, and the host of angels.

D·d

This

This is a fact too well known to need any particular proof; but, however, let me, by way of specimen, exemplify this species of error, by producing an instance of it from the great *Bochart*; which, as this learned man was not less skilled in sacred than in prophane knowledge, is so much the more remarkable, and may serve to teach us, that before we venture to assert an agreement between the Pagans and the Bible in any article of moment, a proper degree of caution, even in the greatest men, is absolutely necessary.

Sanckoniatho, in his *Cosmogony*, after he has asserted his first dark principle of the universe, and a second God begotten of him by a self-concupiscence, sets down, in the third order, a sort of dæmons or intelligent animals, which he calls *Zophesemin*, spies or inspectors of the heavens, each of them formed in the shape of an egg, and generated from mudⁱ; which *Zophesemin* are supposed by *Bochart*, to mean the celestial angels, the intelligent and real inhabitants of the invisible heavens. A criticism so evidently absurd and contrary to truth, that I shall

ⁱ Euseb. Præp. Evan. l.b. 1. c. 10.

shall not undertake to disprove it; and the rather, because it is taken proper notice of by the learned bishop *Cumberland*^k.

This unaccountable fancy of searching for sacred truth amongst the writings of professed idolaters, hath had too many and too able advocates both ancient and modern; and though we ought not to suspect, that in all cases it proceeds from a very bad principle, yet can it seldom or never be referred to a very good one; and every attempt towards reconciling the sacred and prophane system, must be in general fruitless and unsatisfactory: for though it be granted, that upon

D d 2

the

^k The learned *Bochart* hath rightly given the original of the name *Zophesemim* from the Hebrew צִפְּתִים, signifying *speculators* or *observers*, and שָׁמַיִם *heaven*; but he does violence to the author's whole text and scope; besides that he opposes *Eusebius*'s just reflection upon him, as not propounding the inhabitants of heaven, *i. e.* the angels, for Deities, when he interprets these *Zophesemim* to be angels. For how should angels be bred, as these are said to be, out of mud? How, when angels are so generated, shall the sun, moon, and stars, shine out? how shall angels be shaped like an egg, or in a roundish form? The truth is, his mind was prepossessed with Christian notions, and he vainly imagined that an Hea-then must be so too. But *Sanchoniatho* meant only, that the celestial bodies are *intelligent*, and see what is done here below; and, therefore, were to be adored as Gods. *Remarks upon the Hist. of Sanch.* p. 21.

the rise and progress of idolatry after the flood, the most ancient Heathens carried off many sublime mysteries of the true religion, and purloined more in after ages from the people of God, yet when they were in possession of them, they mixed them up with their own muddy principles, then strained away the purer part of the mixture, and let it run to waste : so that if we now seek it again from them, there is little to be found but their own filthy sediments instead of it. And if in scattered fragments, borrowed from the *Hebrews*, there should be found some dark notices of the true God, yet, after all, we are not to form our sentiments from the Heathen theology, but to reform and correct that by the Christian.

C H A P. VIII.

His remarks upon the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds obviated.

THE intent of the essay-writer in these remarks is, to point out a few contradictions both in the language and in the

sense of these two Creeds, when compared either with themselves, or with each other. But, I fear, that whatever contradictions we shall meet with, they will at last prove to be nothing but the genuine produce of his own imagination. I will try the experiment, by setting down these remarks separately, and subjoining a reply to each of them.

Remark I., “ The doctrine of *three Hypostases*, was not the doctrine of the council of *Nice*, but was afterwards adopted by some of the *Consubstantialists*, and was inserted in that Creed which goes under the name of *Athanasius*; but which could not possibly have been written by him, because he, as well as the rest of the *Nicene Fathers*, insisted upon it, that there was but *one Hypostasis* in the Trinity, any more than one *Ufia* ¹.”

His reason then for affirming that the Creed which goes under the name of *Athanasius*, could not possibly have been written by him, is, because he insisted upon it, that there was but *one Hypostasis* in the Trinity, any more than one *Ufia*. In which, we have

have a slight specimen of the *mendacissimum*: for, on the contrary, *Athanasius* insisted upon it, that in the Trinity, there is one *Usia* and three *Hypostases*: as a proof of which, the following instances will be esteemed sufficient. In his *questions*, we find these two, with their respective answers—*How many essences do you confess in the Godhead?* Ans. *I confess ONE essence, one nature, &c.* Qu. *How many Hypostases do you confess in the Godhead?* Ans. *I confess THREE HYPOSTASES or Persons, &c^m.* And again, in his *dialogue* with a *Macedonian*, he says, Τεως εμχαδεις οτι και η παλαια Διαθνηκη οιδεν πως ΤΡΕΙΣ Υποστασεις ⁿ. *Hitherto you have been made to understand, that even the Old Testament declares for the doctrine of THREE Hypostases.* It is likewise clear, that *Athanasius* never meant to confound the sense of these terms, so as to make them synonymous, because he has explained the one, *Hypostasis*, by προσωπον, *person*, and the other, *Usia*, by φυσικη, *nature*; which are as distinct in their significations, as any other terms whatever.

II.

^m Επὶ τῇ θεῷ ποσὰς ὁμοιοῦσι; ΑΠ. Μίαν ὁμοιοῦσιν λέγω, μίαν φύσιν, &c. ΕΡ. Υποστασεις; δε ποσὰς ὁμοιοῦσι ἐπὶ τῇ θεῷ; ΑΠ. Τρεῖς υποστασεις ὁμοιοῦσιν, τρεῖς προσωπα, &c. V. II. p. 442.

ⁿ V. I. p. 223.

II. “ *Socrates*, the ecclesiastical historian,
 “ says from *Iræneus*” (the *grammarian*, not
 the *Father*) “ that though the word *Hypo-*
 “ *stasis* was not used by the more ancient
 “ philosophers, yet, says he, you must un-
 “ derstand that the moderns make use of
 “ it instead of *ουσα* °.”

Socrates does not speak of the *moderns*,
 as intimating the *Christians*, but the modern
Greek philosophers; and our business at pre-
 sent is not with them, but with the inten-
 tion of the *Nicene Fathers*.

III. “ To say therefore that the three
 “ Persons in the Trinity are one *Usia* and
 “ three *Hypostases*, is the same thing as to
 “ say, that they are *one substance* and *three*
 “ *substances* at the same time; which I take
 “ to be a contradiction in terms, and there-
 “ fore cannot be affirmed even of God him-
 “ self P.”

No: it is the same thing as to say, that
 they are *three Persons* and *one nature*; since
Athanasius explains the word *Hypostasis* by
πρσωπον, *person*, and *Usia* by *φυσις*, *nature*;
 which is therefore so far from being a
 contradiction in terms, that it is the very
 thing

° P. 136.

P Ibid. and 137.

thing the church means to express and insist upon.

IV. " When it is said in the *Nicene*
 " Creed, that the Son is *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πα-*
 " *τρὸς*, of the substance of the Father, and
 " that he is *ὁμοῦσι τῷ Πατρὶ*, of one
 " *substance with the Father* — wherein does
 " the difference consist? Why, in being
 " said to be *three* substances at the same
 " time that they are but *one* substance¹."

It is not said, either in this place or any where else, that the Persons of the Trinity are *three substances*; but when a man is so violently heated with his own opinion, he can never attend to any thing but what he himself says. By the former of these expressions, we are to understand (as it is said in the Creed itself) that the Son was *γεννηθεὶς*, begotten, *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*, of or from the substance of the Father; and by the latter, that when so begotten, he was *ὁμοῦσι*, of the same substance, nature, or essence, with the Father, though a different *Person* from him. He may therefore, nay, and must surely, if he was begotten of the Father, be of the same essence or nature from which he

¹ Ibid.

he was begotten, and yet, not be confounded in person with the Father: which was the heresy of *Sabellius*, who maintained that the Trinity was *μονοπροσωπον*, i. e. that it consisted of one Person numerically the same, but *τριωνυμον*, distinguished by three different appellations.

V. “ I am very sensible that in our *English* translation of the Creed, commonly called the *Athanasian* Creed, we have followed the church of *Rome*, whose infallibility can give what sense it pleases to words, in rendering the word *Υποστασις*, by the *English* word *person*, that church having rendered it by the *Latin* word *persona*.”

Athanasius, *Epiphanius*, and all the *Greek* Fathers^s, have metaphrased it by the *Greek* word *προσωπον*, *person*; and therefore we have not followed the church of *Rome*’s *Latin* word. This remark is succeeded by a long and most perplexed criticism upon the

^r P. 138.

^s *Υποστασις και προσωπον ταυτον εστι παρ’ αυτοις. Hypostasis & persona idem est apud illos. Sc. Patres. Leont. De Sect. p. 388. And Suidas affirms, that Υποστασις κατα την εκκλησιαστικην και αποστολικην παραδοσιν εστι το προσωπον—Hypostasis, according to ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition, is the same with person.*

the different acceptations of the word *person*, as applied to *men* : which is all wide of the point ; because we have no concern either with its application to distinct and separate men, or to the same man considered in different capacities, but to the Godhead : and when thus applied, we know what we would mean by it, and scorn any low equivocations about it. This attempt upon the *words* whereby we express our faith, is no new thing : for whoever is in the least conversant with ecclesiastical antiquity, will find that the *Arians* always harboured the most implacable malice against them : for which, no other cause can be assigned, than that these terms, when applied so properly as they are in the Creeds, cut their heresy up by the roots—*hinc illæ lachrymæ* ! Nor did their wrath confine itself to the terms, but did likewise most amply exert itself against the *Nicene* Bishops, who, with others, that embraced their sentiments, were looked upon by these gentlemen as nothing better than *fools* and *idiots* †, while themselves were the only wise and knowing amongst mankind.

VI. " I cannot help saying, it is something odd to have these two Creeds (the " *Nicene* and *Athanasian*) established in the " same church, in one of which those are " declared to be accursed, who deny the " Son to be of the same *Hypostasis* or *Ufia* " with the Father; and in the other, it is " declared *they cannot be saved*, who do not " assert, that *there is one Hypostasis of the* " *Father, and another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost*." "

This seeming contradiction arises only from his confounding the words *ὁμοία* and *ὁμοουσιος*: for though it be said, in the *anathema* annexed at the end of the *Nicene* Creed, that they are *accursed* who say that the Son is *of any other Hypostasis* or *Ufia* than of the Father, yet when it is considered, that the Son is of the *Hypostasis* in one sense, and of the *Ufia* in another, the *Athanasian* and *Nicene* Creeds are by no means at variance. Thus, the Son, as *God*, is *of the Father's Ufia*, and partakes of that divine *nature* or *essence*, from which he is generated: as a *Son*, he is begotten of the Father's *Hypostasis* or *Person*; which makes

the contradiction vanish entirely ; since it shews, that there may be three *Hypostasis* in the Godhead, as the *Athanasian* Creed sets forth ; and that the Son may be begotten of the Father's *Hypostasis*, as it is asserted in the *Nicene*. But, even supposing his observation upon this *anathema* to be just, yet his suspicion of *oddness* in the establishment of the church is altogether groundless, since it is wholly omitted in that form of the *Nicene* Creed inserted in our *Book of Common Prayer* ; and therefore it is weak to calumniate the Protestant church, for establishing what it hath never established at all.

These are all the remarks I thought it necessary to take any notice of. But the author of them, supposing they have put us into such disorder, that our only way is, to make a fair retreat, and give up the matter as unintelligible, bestows upon us the following sneer——“ In order to obviate all
 “ these objections, it is thought sufficient
 “ by some, to say, that there are many
 “ powers in the divine nature, which human beings are not capable of comprehending^w.” But, with humble submission,

sion, this hath not been my way of *obviating these objections*: and though such a declamatory method would have spared me much trouble, yet have I endeavoured to set them all aside, by shewing that, in effect, there are no real objections either against the sense of a Trinity in Unity, or against the manner in which this doctrine is set forth in the Creeds. For whatever degree of humility and acquiescence is expected in relation to the articles of our faith, neither the scripture, nor the church-catholic requires us to believe that the Holy Trinity are one and three in *one and the same respect*; which would indeed be a most insuperable contradiction; but in the sense we hold it, it plainly appears, that there is none.

As for his frequent use of the name *Consubstantialists*, as if those, who believe a *consubstantial* Trinity, were some private party or sect of Christians dissenting from the truth—his charging us with following the *Pope's infallibility*—and his affirming with such confidence, that the *revelation of this wonderful doctrine came originally from the Papal chair*^x——it is all a mere
trick ;

^x P. 151.

trick ; just the same with his comparing us to the *bigotted members of the church of Rome*, for regarding our ecclesiastical subscription, as all honest men and conscientious, who believe the articles of their faith, ought to regard it. For though in the holy scriptures it be not asserted *totidem literis*, that the Trinity is *consubstantial*, yet is it expressly declared, that *the Lord our God is ONE JEHOVAH*, and that *the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are ONE*, that is, one eternal nature, co-equal in majesty, wisdom, power, and every other attribute of essential divinity. At our baptism we are, after the ordinance of *Christ* our Lord, solemnly initiated into the faith of a Trinity in Unity—The inspired Apostles, and from them the church-catholic, pronounce their blessings in strict conformity with this faith, as the High Priest, on the day of the great yearly attonement, did upon the *Israelites* by a threefold repetition of the name *Jehovah*^y : and the two Testaments, as hath been shewn, abound with the revelation of this divine mystery.

It

^y Numb. vi. 24.

It is therefore, without all controversy, a scriptural truth, that the Godhead is ONE, and that in this Godhead there are *Three Persons*: and if the *author* can devise any method of expressing their *unity* more fully and more sensibly than by the word *consubstantial*, let him advance it: but to represent the whole as of no higher an original than the *Papal chair*, when even the very word *consubstantial* was not borrowed from thence, is to betray the weakness of his own cause, and offer an affront to the common sense of every *Protestant* Christian.

Another method he takes of blending this doctrine and Popery together, is by observing, that “ when the *Protestants* argue against “ the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, the *Papists* never fail objecting the equal incredibility of a *consubstantial* Trinity.” This is very true: but a *Protestant* is not bound to answer for the indiscretion of a *Papist*, in putting the doctrine of a *consubstantial* Trinity upon a level with a *transubstantiation* of the sacramental elements: and a parallel between these two doctrines cannot possibly turn out to the disadvantage of the former, since

since the one is subjected to the scrutiny of our senses, and contradicts them; the other is above our senses, and does not. If indeed he rejects the mystery of a Trinity in Unity, because he is pleased to think it *incredible*, the argument drawn from hence carries with it no more weight than that of a bad example: for the question to be decided, is not, whether *he* believes this doctrine, since thousands beside him have disbelieved it, but whether it is revealed in the holy scriptures; of which, not a single *Iota* could be affected by the disbelief of the whole world. *For what if some do not believe? shall their unbelief make the word of God without effect? God forbid! yea, let God be true, but every man (that opposes him) a liar.*

F I N I S.

